A PLAYNE DEMONSTRATION OF IOHN Frithes lacke of witte and learnynge in his vnderstandynge of holie Scripture, and of the olde holy doctours, in the blessed Sacrament of the Aulter, Newly set foorthe by Iohn Gwynneth Clerke.

LONDINI.
1557.

130. f. 21.

Qui cupit Hæretici, nunc ſcire Sophiſmata Frythi,
Plebs, quibus, eſt miris ludificata modis.
Commonſtrat Gvvinneth tibi Clericus, ecce Iohannes,
Iſto quem fecit Codice Marte ſuo.
In quo ſe multum videas ſumpſiſſe laboris
Præſertim, quem nunc cana ſenecta premit.
Pœnitet haud tanti, tamen, ipſum omnino laboris,
Se tibi fructiferum, ſi modo percipiat.

BIBLIOTHECA·BODLEIANA·

The Prologue.

O M M Chriſten reders, where as of late, in the begynnynge of my writing againſt Frithes booke, I promyſed this order.

Firſte to ſet forthe by it ſelfe, what maner of ſtate it is, wherin an Heretike leadeth his life.

Secondarily, what manner of foundation it is, that Frithe bildeth his wycked purpoſe vpon.

Thirdly, how falſelie he dothe vnderſtande, not onlie the holy ſcripture, but alſo the olde holie Fathers, and auncient Doctours of the Catholike churche.

Fourthly how crafty, falſe, and fooliſhe, his reaſons, and argumentes are to be founde, yf they be well and truely tried.

Fiftly, what is to be ſayd againſt his opinion, that one body can not be in two places at once.

Sixtlie, that the poſſibilite therof, maie be proued by very good reaſon.

Ye ſhall vnderſtand, that of this diuiſion, the firſt and ſeconde parte, I haue perfourmed and put forthe all ready, although but rudely and not in all poyncte euen as I wolde, if my haſt to the reſt, had not ben the greater. But yet ſufficiently, and euen more then enoughe, to ſhowe the due proufe of ſo much as I thereby did intende, And now therefore, here dothe folowe the thirde

parte, for which, I dispatched my handes with the more quicker speede of the other two paste. And that not with out cause. For in thys consisteth the very chiefe pithe of my principall purpose in all the reste. Which is to make his false vnderstandinge of the olde holye Doctours and their trew meanynges playnly to appere. And therefore I wishe, all those in especiall, whiche hath moost nede therof, to loke well, and wisely vpon it. And therin to haue no respecte vnto me, nor yet to any payne or labour bestowed of my parte in that behalfe. But to haue good respecte only to the trewth, which is and may clerly be founde therin. Whereof I dare say, they shall not misse, if they be of suche good wyll, as without whyche, they cannot be saued. For if good will, be to vs in all thinges so necessari, that we can nothing do rightly with out it, how muche more nercssary is it to be had, aboute the trial of trewth, in so weighty and worthy a matter, as is the very reall presence of the blessed body of our Saviour Christ in the holy Sacrament: For to sum vp the trewth, of a most weighty, & worthy thing, there is alwaies required a moste pure, and parfit good will. Whiche is never mixed with pride, nor vayne glory, never infected with disdayne, nor envy, never yoked with stout stubbernes, nor obstinacie, but ever indewed with meekenesse and humilite, with dew feare of God and charite, with patience and pitie of mannes wealnes and infirmite, for onely to men of that sorte were, these moste gratious and merrifull promyses made.

» Petite et dabitur vobis, quærite & inuenietis, pulsate » & aperietur vobis. That is to say.

» Aske, and to you it shall be geuen, seeke, and ye shal finde, knocke,

knocke and it shalbe opened vnto you.

And therfore what is more precious, and more expedient to be had, then the trewth of this holy Sacrament: wherfore, let him take hede whiche hathe it not. For when shall he haue it, yf he wyll not so muche as aske it: when shall he fynde it, if he wyll not vouchesafe to seeke it: or when shall he enter into it, if he wyll not knocke to be let in: The doore is not to be opened, but onely to them that wyll knocke. The thynge is not to be founde, but onely of them that wyll seeke. Neyther is it to be graunted, but onely to theym that will aske. And who doeth aske for it: who doeth seeke after it: or who doeth knocke, to enter into it: In verie deede, none rightlie, none wyselye, nor anie profitably, but onely those, that be of good wyll. Wherfore onelie to them (as I sayde) those promyses were made. And therefore it is not enoughe, to reade, to talke, or to reason, and question of the matter. But it is muche more to be wayed and considered, wyth what maner of wyll, and intente, all that is done. For trueth is a Lady, alwaies of that straingenes, that she wyl not vouchesaufe to showe her amiable face, but onelie to them that be of good will. For yf any other by chaunce fortune sometyme to see her, (specially there, where they haue no lust or desyre to meete with her) indeede vnto them, for all her bewtifull countenaunce, she geueth but a lowrynge looke, wyth smale occasion of anie credence. And no maruell whye, for those be they, of whome the Scripture doth say. Mat. 13.

They see and see not, They here and here not.

And that is not all for lacke of knowledge, but in very

deede for lacke of good will. For as the common sayinge is.

Who is so blinde as he, that will not see.

Therfore good will (Gentle readers) good wyll is it, whiche dothe bothe aske and obteyne, seeke and fynde, knocke and is harde, and so let in. For without that, moste trew it is, that nothing can speede in thys kynde of thynges. Wherfore this matter, is to be weyed, and pondered therafter. For who dothe not knowe, that readers there be of dyuerse and sundry sortes.

Wherof some wyll sone conceiue myslykinge, if they fynde but the matter any thinge longe in readinge, and say, it is to tedious. Now be it in very deede those be they, of whome men may say.

They are sone wery of well doinge.

Some other there be whiche in reading, falleth straytes into mislikyng, if they fynde any thinge passe their vnder standinge, saying it is very darke and to obscure. And all because, they loue not in such good labour, any while to tarry or longe indure. But of that, they do fyxte, they will make the lasse, and so giue it ouer.

Some, yf they finde not the matter, sette out wyth paynted speeche according to theyr pleasure, streyght, they wyll say it is verie grose, and but rudely dunne, without witte or learninge, and so make that an excuse of theyr mislikinge.

Some will mislike the matter, because of the wryter. And some the wryter, because of the matter.

And some not eche for other, but euen indifferently bothe together. But what esteemers, or louers of trewth shall we recken all these, which wyll thynke it to derelie bought.

bought, with bearing the light burden of a litle tedioulnes: or to paynfully gotten, with the labouring awaye of a litle obscuritee, and darkenes: or to be the lesse worthy good acception, for lacke of some syne and curious expression: or to be regarded after the writer. And not, as it ought to be, euen after the matter: what esteemers (I saye) or louers of trewth shall we reckon these: how vnworthy of trewth be they, whiche wyll other refuse it, or set the lesse by it, for these causes or anie other lyke: specially in so great a matter, as thys holy Sacrament is: Wherfore thys muche haue I sayde, for a louinge warnynge, and a frindly monition, only to them, whiche hath neede therof. Trustinge, that when this, that foloweth shall come to their redynge, they wyll not forget this necessary warninge, but well and wisely will beare it in mynde, and vse them selues accordingly. For otherwise, reade they may, but profit they can not. And therfore now good Christen readers, because no man is, or can be herein, sufficient of hym selfe, but as the holy Apostle dothe say.

¶ Our sufficiencie is of God, I wyshe vnto you, as euen to my selfe, the perpetuall succour and helpe of that holie Spirit, whiche is the worker and mercifull giuer of euerie good will. To whome wyth the Father, and the Sonne, be honour and glorye now and euer. Amen. 2. Cor. 3

¶

IT is to be noted that where I doe not recite the woordes of Frythe, nor any of his allegacions, but that I shewe in what leafe of his booke, the reader maie fynde it, ye shall vnderstande, that I meane it of his booke whiche is of the first printe, bearinge date Anno Domini 1533. for his booke of any other later prynte (which I haue heard of and not seene) maie chaunce to varie from the fyrste, in the numbre of leaues. And so by reason of that, it might peraduenture be thought, that other (I saie) not truely of him, or els of the places, where I report him to saie, as he dothe. In auoydinge wherof I haue thought it good to geue this knowledge therof before.

The argumentes of the chapiters.

THE cause, why Frythe doth alledge the olde holie doctours, and specially Saynt Austen. Cap. 2.

That his false vnderstandynge of Saint Austene proued, is ful proofe enough against him, in all the rest of the olde holy fathers beside, and of the scripture also. Cap. 3.

How Fryth doth handle this text, This is my bodie: and Sainct Austen vpon the same. Cap. 4. & 5.

How Frith behaueth him selfe in his allegacion of Saint Austen wrytyng against Adamantus. Cap. 6.

What Frithe concludeth of the Sacrament, and what he maketh of Christe. Cap. 7.

How frith lieth vpon the plaine litterall sence of Scripture. Cap. 8.

How Frithe vnder pretence of Englishinge Saynt Austens woordes, doth therin falsly expounde theim for his owne purpose. Cap. 9.

How

How he lyeth vpon Sayncte Austene: and what an argument he maketh betwene this worde, eate, and this terte, This is my bodie. Cap.10.
That this text, This is my body, hath a litterall sense proued by Saint Austen directly agaynst Frithes purpose. Cap.11.
How falsely Frithe dothe vnderstande this that Sayncte Austen sayth, Christe bore himselfe in his owne handes after a certayne manner, and what a certaine maner is. Cap.12.&13.
How Frythe pretendeth to beleue Saynt Austen, and yet beleueth him not in dede. Cap.14.
Of the good and perfit agrement of the wordes of Saynt Austen, where he sayth, ye shall not eate thys body that ye see, nor dryncke that bloud whiche they that crucifie me shall shede out. And where he saythe, Christe hathe geuen vs the same flesh to eate, wherin he walked here in yerth. Cap.15.16.
How directly Frithe in apert wordes is agaynst Christe. Cap.17.
How Frythe deceyued him selfe in thys text, what if ye see the sonne of man ascendynge thyther where he was before: and how he belieth Saynt Austen vpon the same. Cap.18.
What a parte Frithe playeth with Saynt Austen in vnderstandynge of this texte, The flesche profiteth nothing. Ca.19.
That Frithe gathered out of the olde Fathers sayinges, not theyr meanynges, but his owne foolyshe dremynges, wherby he deceyued himselfe and other also. Ca.20
What the spirituall vnderstanding of this matter is. And that Frithe vnderstode it not. Cap.21.22.
That it is not euen properly spoken to saye, that Christe hath now a naturall body or naturall flesche. Cap.23.
What spirituall vnderstandynge is, after the mynde of Chrisostome. Cap.24.
He that vnderstandeth Christes flesche to be immortall,

and vnderstandeth nothing in it to the contrary, vnderstandeth it Spiritually. Cap.25.
That those whiche are and shalbe dampned in Hell and so continewe for euer, can not for all that, be trewly & properly called immortall. Cap.26
That there is nothing now in Christes body, that may be so vnderstande, as it is now in our bodies, or was in his, before his resurrection. Cap.27.&.28.
How falsly Frithe dothe vnderstande those places of S. Austen, whiche he dothe alledge out of his worke. De Ciuitate dei, libro.21. Cap.25. and out of his sermon (as Frithe dothe note it) De sacra feria Pasche. Cap.29.&.30
How manye maner of wayes the blessed body of Christe is eaten. And whether it may be properly sayde, to be any way eaten corporally or not. Cap.31
Of the difference that is betewne Corpus & Corporale, That is to say, betwene a body and a bodely thynge or perteynyng to a body. Cap.32.
That the Sacrament in respect of it selfe, is not corpus, that is to say, not a body, and yet it is corporall. And that there is no such corporalite in Christes bodie now, as is in ours. Cap.33
That althoughe the blessed body of Christe, be of good Catholike men, for dyuerse good causes, called corporall and naturall, yet it is not properly so, but supernaturall and supercorporall. Cap.34
Whether the quantite of Christes body now, be suche as ours is, or whether he hathe his quantite therof, as we haue ours or no. Cap.35.&.36
That Frithe dothe not alledge Saynt Austen vpon certain textes of Scripture euen there, where he goeth euen purposely vpon them, but taketh hym in other places, where he toucheth but parte of the sense, to confyrme therby suche other matter as he hath in hande. And the cause why, that Frithe dothe vse hym so. Cap.37.
The cause why, that Saynt Austen doth some time write more obscurely to vs, then he doth to heretikes. Cap.38

That

That, not only the very reall eatinge of Chriſtes bleſſed body in the holy Sacrament, whiche is generall, but alſo the ſpirituall eating of it whiche is ſpeciall, is proued by Saynt Auſten. Cap.39.

That Frithe by Saynt Auſten is conuinced in this, that he woulde haue none other eating of Chriſtes very body but only ſpirituall, whiche he meaneth to be nothyng els in effecte, but onlie to beleue that Chriſt died for vs. Cap.40.&.41.

That if Frithes fayth were trew, the ordinance of man in the Roode, ſhuld be better then the ordinance of chriſt in the Sacrament. Cap.42.

What a falſe parte Frithe playeth with Saynt Ambroſe, and of the cauſe why. And what he ſeyth of Gelaſius. Cap.43.&.44.

What falſe diſſimulation Frithe vſeth in the ſayinges of the olde holy fathers. And how directly he is therin a-geynſt hym ſelfe. Cap.45

That this worde ſubſtance, and alſo this worde nature, are taken and vſed eache of them very diuerſly. Cap.46.

The fautes escaped in the prynt-
tynge apeereth in the later ende of the booke.

HERETICVS. O sir, who coulde haue made me beleue, that ye wold haue serued me after this sorte? CATHOLICVS. Why what is the matter? HER. Is this to morow? CATH. No, this is to daie. HERE. Tushe, will ye be there? ye wot what I meane well enoughe. For did ye not promise me at our last partyng (after ye had declared your minde vpon that parte of Iohn Frithes booke whiche he calleth his foundation) that we shoulde here haue mette together againe, the next morrow after? CATH. Was it Monday, Tewsdaie, or Wenesday, whan I made thee that promyse? HERE. Tewsdaie. CATH. And what daie is this? HERE. Mary Wenesdaie. CATH. And is not Wenesday the next morowe after Tewsdaie. HERE. Ye, but I praie you sir, how many Wenesdaies hath there bene sence that Tewsdaie? And yet could I (from that tyme hytherto) neuer meete with you tyll now. CATH. Meruaile not therat. For to be short and playne, thou shalt vnderstande, that there chaunced vnto me suche busines, immediately after our partynge, that I coulde neuer haue tyme conuenient, to discharge my selfe of that promyse tyll now. And therfore euen now am I cum, only for that purpose and nothyng els. Wherfore, if thou take this Wenesday, euen as the next morowe after that Tewsday, it is no great matter, for al shalbe one in the reckenynge, sith I will performe now,

now, no lesse then I promised then. HERE. If ye so do, I will be very glad. For in your so doyng, we shall haue (as I gesse) some straunge talke ere we parte. CATH. Thou maiest be sure of that, for the matter requireth no lesse. HERE. Yet first I pray you, may not a man be so bolde as to aske you, what your busines hath bene all this while, which hath so long kept you from the performance of your promise? CATH. Thou maiest not onely aske, but also know it to, if thou wilte. HE. Perchaunce I know a good parte of it all redie. CATH. Thinkest thou so? HERE. Ye trewly. For I dare say that your cherke let, hath ben about the writting of al the talke, that you and I haue had to gether, both the first daie, and also the second. CATH. How knowest thou that? HERE. By such a meane as deceaueth me not, for wot ye what? CATH. What? HERE. In verie deede, it is now in print, & abrode in many mēs hands. CATH. What is it? HERE. Euen as I tell yow. CATH. And what of that? HERE. Nothyng els, but as I tolde you at the first, that it wold displease a great sorte, if it came to their heringe, as it doth now in deede. CATH. And did not I then tel the againe, that it could displease none, but onely suche, as would other kepe their grefe therof secretly to them selues, or els in their disclosinge therof vnto other, show them selues what they be. HER. Ye but yet for all that, it goeth farder then so. For besyde those, whom ye meane, it doth not please some other, whiche are (as ye rounte them) euen both wise, and also learned. CATH. That maie chaunce to be trew, how be it, although it dothe not please them, yet is it enoughe to me, that

it doothe not displeale them. HERE. It muste needes displeale them, when it doth not pleale them. CATHOLICVS. That foloweth not. For it is two thinges to displeale, and to not pleale although they seme and be some tyme vsed and taken for bothe one. For not pleale, is properlie but as it were a meane betwene pleale, and displeale. As it maie wel apeere by the diuersitee of thinges, wherof some dothe pleale, and therin they gender delight. And some doth displeale, and therin they gender greefe. And some be indifferent, and they do nother of them bothe, that is to say, nother pleale nor displeale. And therfore, of that sorte I take my labour to bee, to them that be learned and wyse. For although it be harde for them to be pleased with that, whiche they coulde doe farre better them selues, yet their wisdome and learnynge, will not suffer them to be displeased with that, whiche holdeth the trewth, and refelleth the contrary, although not so aptly as they coulde frame it. Wherfore mine intencion therin, was not so muche, to pleale those of learnyng which be wise, and of my helpe hath no neede, as it was to helpe those ignorannte heades, whiche for lacke of grace and learnyng bothe, are not so wise, and therfore of helpe, hath verie great neede. And this, those learned whiche be wise, doth wey and consider well enoughe: Beyng (as alway they are) more willyng to set forward the trewth with their good patience, then to hurt or hinder it, with any dispraise or great misliking, of my simple handlyng therof. And therfore tell not me of any displesure taken withal, but only among such, as I tolde thee of before. HERE. Well sir, yet I woulde

wishe

wishe you, nother to do, nor say, that shoulde displease any man. CATH. Why doest thou wishe that to me, more than to an other? HERE. I wishe it not onely to you, but also to other like wyse. CATH. And I wish vnto thee, a little more wit, than to wishe so to me, or to any man els. For doubtles therin, thou wishest awaie with the best doinge, and also good saiynge, that euer was, or shalbe vsed of any man. HERE. Do I so? CATH. Thow doest no lesse. For who hath done or said so, ỳ he hath therein displeased no man? I dare say, not the holy apostles, nor our Sauiour Christe him selfe nother. Therfore thou makest herein the strangest wish, that I haue herde. wherein thow doest not consyder, this notable saiyng of the holy Apostle Saynt Paule.

Galat. I. Si hominibus placerem, Seruus Christi non essem. That is to saie, If I shoulde please men, I shoulde not be the seruaunt of Christe.

Therfore, who can do, speake, or wryte, that shall displease no man?

Cap. 2.

HERE. Sir I praie you let all that passe. And let me here what ye can say to the dispatch of your promise. CATH. What was that? HERET. Haue you for gotten? CATH. No not so. But yet, although I haue not forgotten it my selfe, I doubt for all that, whether thou doest so well remember it, as the truthe therof doth requyre. HERE. Yes sir that I do, for your saiyng was this, that ye coulde, and wold proue, that John Fryth did fallsly vnderstande, both the Scrypture, and also the olde holy Doctours to. And

farther

farther moze, that his reasons were and are, but deceaueable sophisticacions, and nothing els. CATH. Treiw it is. That was my saiyng in deede. And foz the perfourmaunce therof (whiche is the cause of our meetinge here now) thou shalt vnderstande, that he dothe not alledge those holy doctours, foz any thynge moze, then foz the pzoofe and confirmaciō of his owne intellection, and vnderstandyng of those Scriptures, whiche he woulde haue vs beleue, doth make foz his purpose. And therfoze, when I shal pzoue his vnderstandynge of those holy doctours to be vtterly false, and far from their meanyng in deede, shal not that be a sufficient pzoofe, that other they make directly against hym, oz els at the least, nothyng foz him? And therfoze if they make nothynge foz him, why dooeth he alledge them? If they make against him, is not also that, euen pzoofe enough, of his false vnderstandynge of Scripture, whiche he woulde defende by them? when his saiynge is ye, and their meanyng nate? Except thou wilt saie, that he is moze credible then all they, when he neuer thought so him selfe: Foz if he had, he woulde not haue brought them in, foz his wytnesse as he dooeth. HERE. Well sir, when ye haue made this pzoofe ye spake of, you shall then, know farther of my mynde. CATH. With that am I well contente. And therfoze now to drawe neare vnto it, thou must (foz a moze compendious breuitee of the matter) farther consyder, that as he bringeth the olde holie doctours foz nothinge so muche, as (if it would bee) to confirme his false vnderstandynge of Scripture, so he bringeth none of them all sauynge one, but to confirme his false vnderstandynge of that same one, whom he ta-

keth onely to be enough for his purpose. Wherfore if I proue him false in his vnderstandynge of that one, it must needes folow, that he is therin proued false in his vnderstandynge of all the rest. HERE. Ye but which one of them is that? CATHO. If thou wilte needes knowe, it is euen holy Saint Austen. HERE. And how know you, that he bryngeth in, all the rest of the holy doctours, onely to confyrme his vnderstanding of Saint Austen? or that he vnderstandeth Saynt Austen falsely, as ye say he dooth.

Cap. 3.

CATH. I will recite vnto thee some of his owne saiyng, and by that, thou maiest perceiue how I know it. For in the 30 leafe of his booke, he thinkyng, or feinyng, that he hath his purpose proued by S. Austen, doth say these woordes.

> This were proofe enough (saith he) to conclude, that all the olde fathers did hold the same opinion. For who wold once surmise (seyng we haue S. Austen so plaine for vs, which is the chiefest amonge them al, who wold once surmise (I say) that he dissented in this great matter, from the other faithfull fathers, or they from him? Neuertheless, I dare not let him stande post alone, least ye dispise him. And therfore I will shew you the mynde of certeine other also. And also of his maister Saint Ambrose. &c.

In these woordes of his, it appereth playne, and much worthy to be noted, that he doth not only bryng the olde holy fathers to confyrme his vnderstandynge of Saint Austen, but also that, (to fortifie the same) he would haue no man, so much as once surmise, that S. Austen in this great matter, dissented from other the faithful fa

thers

thers, noz they from him, as I graunt al that to be trew in deede. But what a surmise is this of him, that (as he saith) he dare not let Saint Austen stande post alone, lest we wold despise him, if he shoulde not bringe forth the minde of the other faithfull fathers to defende him: where tooke he any occasion thus to surmise, but only of his owne arrogant fooliche head, to make ignorant persons beleue, that this holy man S. Austen maketh clerely for him in his wicked purpose: as in the. 29. leafe of his booke, he boasteth in plaine wordes, which are these. Blessed be god (saith he) which hath so cleerely discussed this matter by this faithfull father.

Now, lest thou woldest say or thynke, that this same arrogant surmise of his, proceded not, but (as many a man doth some tyme speake) rashly by chaunce, here him in the. 24. leafe of his booke, where he hath these wordes.

Now were this enough (saith he) for a christen man that loued no contencion. But because there are so many sophisters in the worlde, which care not what they say, so they holde not their peace, I muste needes set some bulwarke by this holie doctour, to helpe to defende him. For els they will shortly ouer runne him (as they do me) and make him an heretyke to. Therfore I will allege his maister Saint Ambrose. &c.

How saist thou now? who can declare his malicious and arrogant blindnesse, so fully as he declareth it him selfe? for what a malicious blindnesse, is this of him, thus to surmise any nede to defende Saint Austen against vs, as thoughe we would not allowe him? Therfore when it may here, of his owne wordes appere, that he bringeth not in, the rest of all those faithfull fathers, for any neede he hath of them, but to defende Saynt

Austen, whom he sayth, is proufe enough for his purpose because he dissenteth not from them, nor they from hym, it must needes folow, that if Frithe be founde false in his vnderstandynge of Saynt Austen, he shalbe therin founde false in his vnderstanding of them all, and of the scripture to, when they do al agree (as he doth confesse) and herin dissent not one from an other. Wherefore what neede I, to trauell aboute the triall of his falshed any farther, but in Saynt Austen only?

Cap. 4.

HERE. Ye but what bringeth he of Saynt Austen that you can proue he dothe not trewlye vnderstande? CATH. Thou shalt sone perceiue what, if thou marke where aboute he goeth, and what his principall purpose is. HERE. Marry syr his principall purpose is thys, to proue, that Christes very body flesh and bloude, is not really, verely, and presently in the sacrament. And to begin his proufe wyth all, hys owne wordes in the. 21. leafe of his booke are these.

„ Except I brynge (he sayeth) euydent Scripture, whiche
„ they all shall expounde as I doe, I desyer not to be be-
„ leeued.

This I dare say is a resonable request. CATH. In very deede, thou sayest euen trewth. For it is so resonable, that I wolde to God, al his folowers wolde assent vnto it, and graunt him no lesse. But I feare that manie of them, graunted hym suche a request at the fyrste, that they wil now deny him this at the last. And therefore as touching his bringing of euident Scripture, and his exposicion of the same, This that I finde in the. 6.

leafe

leafe of his booke, is muche to be noted, where his wordes be these.

In euery text (he sayethe) is but only one verite, for which it was spoken.

And also agayne, in the. 18. leafe he hath these wordes. Some textes of Scripture (he sayth) are only to be vnderstande after the letter, and some textes are only to be vnderstande spiritually, or in the way of an allegory. And some must be vnderstande both litterally and spiritually.

Here we may first aske of hym, how he will proue, that some text must be vnderstande bothe literally and spiritually, if it haue in it (as he sayth it hath) but only one veritee: for onlie one veritee in one text, to haue two sundry vnderstandynges, and bothe trew, is verye straynge, and that more straynge, then may well agree wyth reason, or trewth other. Agayne we maye aske of hym also, why should any one text haue any mo vnderstandinges in it, then any other hathe, if it haue in it but only one verite, as those other hathe, which he sayth are onlie to be vnderstande after the letter, or only spiritually: very repugnant it is, to say (as he dothe) that in euery texte is but only one veritee, for whiche it was spoken, and to say, some text must be vndestande both litterally and spiritually, wherof the one vnderstanding or the other, can not be trew, if the text haue in it but onlie one veritee (as he saythe) it hath. Neuertheleffe, vpon this phantasy of his, euen there dothe he conclude with these wordes.

And I say (sayeth he) that this text of scripture, This is my bodie, is only spiritually to be vnderstand, & not litterally.

How sayest thou to this? doest thou perceyue what he saieth? HERE. Ye very well.

Cap. 5.

CATHOLICVS. Then how wyll he proue that this text, This is my body, is onely spiritually to be vnderstand, and not litterally? HERE. Marrie syr euen by Saynt Austen. For euen there immediatlie folowing he addeth vnto it these wordes.

, And that doth saynt Austen (sayeth he) also confirme, whi
, che writeth vnto Adamantus, and sayeth, These sen-
, tenses of Scripture, Christ was the stone, the bloud is the
, soule, and thys is my bodie, are figuratiuely to be vnder-
, stande, (that is to say spiritually, or by the way of an al-
, legory) and thus haue I Saynt Austen wholie of my syde
, whiche thynge shall yet herafter more playnly appere.

How say ye now? CATH. I say this, that Frithe doth herin but report Saynt Austen thys to saye. And dothe not alledge where, nor yet perchance recite Saint Austens owne wordes, in such order and forme, as he dothe speake them him selfe nother. Wherfore Frith is herein to be rather mistrusted, then beleeued. And beside that, these words which he hym selfe doth here report of Saynt Austen, dothe leaue this text (This is my body) so muche at large, as to be vnderstande litterallie, as well as figuratiuely. And doth not driue it to this narrow streyght of only figuratiuely, as Frithe wolde wrasse and wringe it vnto: for figuratyuely, and only figuratiuely, doth very muche differ. Because, with the one, there may stande an other, but with the other, no more but it selfe alone. It is two thinges to say, that our Sauiour christ is a man, and to say that he is only a man. For the one is sayd trewly, and the other is a damnable heresy. Wherfore as he that sayth Christe is

to be vnderſtande a very man, and yet taketh him not therin to be only a man, nor denieth him to be very god. Euen ſo S. Auſten whiche doth ſay, that this text, This is my body, is to be vnderſtande figuratiuely, dothe not therin ſay or meane it to be vnderſtande only figuratyuely. Nor denieth it to be vnderſtande litterally. For although a thinge be trewly sayde to be ſo or ſo. Yet that draweth not with it this conſequence to be only ſo. But Frith dothe reaſon the matter after this ſorte, as if he ſhould heere a man reported, to be learned in Aſtronomie, he will ſtreyght conclude, that the man can no ſkyll of Philike nor Geometry, but only of Aſtronomy. When for al that report, he may be, as diuerſe ar, lerned: ſome in two, and ſome in all three. Therfore of this kinde of concluſions, I hope thou ſeeſt enoughe. Wherfore, how can Saynt Auſten (whome Frithe hym ſelfe, doth here report, to ſay none otherwiſe of this texte (This is my boody) but that it is to be vnderſtande figuratiuely, make any thinge for him, in this that he ſayth it is to be vnderſtande only figuratiuely and not litterally: when the wordes reported of Saint Auſten maketh no farther mention, but of the one, and not of the other. And yet, without putting any difference betwene ſyguratyuely, and only figuratiuely, or bringing for hym any dew alle gation of Saynt Auſtens owne words where, or in what order he ſpake them him ſelfe, the blinde arrogant foole is not here aſhamed to boſte and ſay, that he hath herein Saynt Auſten, wholy of his ſide. Who doth here nothing touche any parte of hys purpoſe.

Cap.

Cap. 6.

HERETICVS. Sir me thinke ye do vse him, with very vngoodly termes. CATH. Not so vngoodly as he is wozthy. And that shall well apere ere we parte. HERE. Yet where ye say, that he doeth not perchaunce herin alledge saynt Austens woozdes in such ozder, as he doth speake them him selfe, in deede although he dothe it not here, where you impute vnto him that faute, yet he dooeth it afterwarde, in an other place, bothe in latyne, and also in englishe. CATH. Where is that? HERE. In the 30 leafe of his booke his woozdes be these.

» Saynt Austen sayth (saith he) Non enim dominus
» dubitauit dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum da-
» ret signum corporis sui. Et in eodem capite
» exponit. Sic est enim sanguis anima quomodo Pe-
» tra erat Christus, nec tamen Petra (Ait) significa-
» bat Christum sed ait Petra erat Christus.

» That is to say, The Lozde doubted not to saie, this is my
» body, when he gaue a signe of his bodie. And after in the
» same chapiter he expoundeth it. Foz trewly so the bloode
» is soule, as Chzistte was the stone. And yet the apostle
» saith not, the stone dyd signifie Chzistte, but he saieth, the
» stone was Chzistte.

CATH. Is this his allegacion of Saint Austens woozds? HERE. Yea sir. CATH. Wzoperly done. Foz betwene these woozdes of Saint Austens,

» The lozde doubted not to saie, This is my bodie, when he
» gaue a signe of his bodie.

And these woozdes.

» So the blood is the soule, as the stone is Chzistte.

There

There runneth as many woordes mo of Saint Austens beſyde, as I dare ſaie, occupieth nere hande in ſome booke, and hundred lynes.
And betweene theſe woordes.
So the blood is the ſoule, as the ſtone was Chriſte.
And theſe woordes,
yet the Apoſtle ſaieth not the ſtone did ſignifie Chriſt, but he ſaieth the ſtone was Chriſte.

There runneth alſo an other number of woordes and ſentenſes likewyſe: ſo that it is not poſſible for any man to underſtande or perceiue, for what purpoſe Saynt Auſtene dooth ſpeake any of thoſe ſentenſes, beyng thus put foorth, as Frithe dothe here recite them ſeintly together, omittynge that (as he doth) whiche goeth immediately before and after. And beſyde this, thou maiſt alſo perceiue, that theſe woordes which he ſoyneth withall. Saiyng. And after in the ſame chapiter he expoundeth it.

Are none of S. Auſtens woordes, but Frithes owne woordes, craftely put in, to allure vs to beleue, that S. Auſten dothe expounde that, whiche goeth before, with that, that Fryth ſoyneth vnto it after, whiche is this.
For treuly ſo the blood is the ſoule, as chriſt was the ſtone.

Therfore that we maie the better perceiue, howe well this ſaiyng, doth expound the other before (as he ſaith it doth) let vs conſyder them bothe together, to ſee how well they dooe agree. The fyrſt is this.
The lorde doubted not to ſaie, This is my bodie, whan he gaue a ſigne of his bodie.

This as frithe doth ſay, Saint Auſten dooth expounde in the ſame chaptre with theſe woordes.
For trewly ſo the blood is the ſoule, as Chriſte was the ſtone.
How ſaieſt thou now? greeth not theſe two ſaiynges

well together: do they not well depende one of an other: yet Frith doth say, that S. Austen expoundeth the one by the other. Moreouer, what is al this to his purpose of this text, This is my body, to be vnderstand only spiritually, and not litterally, as he saieth it is: Farthermore I wolde fayne know, what he him selfe, dooth farther gather of Saint Austen in this place. HERE. It apereth immediatly folowynge in the same leafe.

CATH. What is that: HE. His woordes be these.

» Here (saith he) Saint Austen saith plainly, that Christ cal-
» led the signe of his bodie, his body. And in this chapter do-
» eth compare these thre tortes of Scripture, This is my bod
» dy, The blood is the soule. And Christ was the stone: & de-
» clareth them to be on phrase, and to be expounded after one
» fashion.

Now haue you harde, what Frith gathereth of this place of S. Austen, and therfore what say you to it: CATH. I say, that S. Austen, saith not here, so plainly, that Christ called the signe of his body, his body, as Frith doth here plainly belie him in so reportyng of him. For S. Austen, hath here no such woordes, as can be wrested vnto that sense. For is it all one to say, that the lord doubted not to say, This is my body, when he gaue a signe of his body. And to say, that he called the signe of his body, his body: As if I ley my hand flat vpō an heape of fyne sande, saiyng, this is my hande, will it followe therof, that I call the signe of my hande, my hande: which signe I make in the sande, by layinge my hande therupon: how be it this consequence is not so straynge, as it is common with frith: Therfore as he lyeth falsly vpon S. Austen in this, so he dothe likewise in the rest, for Saint Austen maketh no suche comparison there, of

chose three texts together, nor declareth them so to be one phrase, nor to be expounded after one fashion, as Frith doth here speake of, and wolde haue vs take it. And therfore to thentet he wold not haue vs come by the triall of his falshed herein, he, fearing least it should be sought out and spied at length, prouoketh vs by the maner of his allegaciō to serche for it there, where he knew right well, we might so longe loke after it, that we shuld be willinge rather to let it passe, then to labour any further for it. HERE. Why say you so? CATH. Because it is so. For diddest thou not thy selfe recite vnto me right now, that Frith saieth, Saint Austen doothe wryte to Adamantus this same that he nowe gathereth herein for his defence? HERE. That is trew. CATH. Then if Saint Austen wrote it (as Fryth sayth he doth) vnto Adamantus, that wrytinge is to be founde, either amonge Saint Austens epistles, (where I dare say it is not) or els in some booke of his, dedicat or intituled to Adamantus by name, where as in deede there is no such nother. Therfore why may I not say, that herin he prouoketh vs to serche & labour in vayne, to the intente we shoulde not fynde wherby, his falshed might be brought to light? HERE. Sir ye take him wrong, for euen there, where S. Austens woordes in latine, before alledged, doth stande in Frithes booke, in the margent of the same place, is noted these woordes. Augustinus contra Adamantum. Wherof the english ye know well enough. CATH. That is no more to saie, but Austen against Adamantus. HERE. Ye say trewth. CATH. Then how frameth these two together, that this is put in the margēt, Austen against Adamātus, and frith saith in the

letter, Saint Austen wrote to Adamantus? for although to Adamantus, and against Adamantus, maie stande together in some respecte, yet so can they not do here. For S. Austen writeth not to Adamantus, but onely of him, and against him. Therfore if Frith him selfe, did make that note in the margent, then he greeth not with him selfe in the letter. If the printer did note it in the margent, to mende Frythes lye therof in the letter, why did none of them both amend this, which Frith doth say, (And in the same chapiter he expounded it) and telleth vs not whiche chapiter, nor yet maketh any mencion therof before nother? Had it beene any great matter for Frythe (if he had ment well) to haue sayd, Saynte Austen in the .12. chapter of his booke written against Adamantus, hath these, and these woordes and so forth: thinkest thou that Frith refused this to do, for no cause, it were not harde to fynde more cause then I speake of now, if a man wouldе waste so muche tyme aboute it, as nedeth not: For thou hast hard enough al ready, to perceiue herein, part of his falle wily sleyghes, wherin he trusted, not so to be sene, as now he is, and more shalbe ere we parte.

Cap. 7.

HERE. I wysshe that ye wolde here his conclusion hereof, before we go any farther. And then will I tell you more. CATH. what conclusion is that? HERE. Immediately after those woordes of his, whiche I last recited vnto you before, he addeth vnto them these.

„Now is there no man (saieth he) so mad as to say, that „Christ was a naturall stone (except he be a natural foole)

whose

whose iudgement we neede not greatly to regarde. Therfore we may well conclude that the sacrament is not hys naturall body: but is called his body, for a similitude that it hath, wherin it signifieth & representeth his body. And that the Sacrament of so great a thinge, is called euen with the name of the very thinge it selfe.

CATH. Is this his conclusion? HERE. Ye trewly.

CATH. Thou sayest well: for those be his wordes in deede. And therefore who is he, that wolde denie hym this conclusion, beinge rightly vnderstande? No man I thinke of any learned iudgement. But what is it to hys purpose of improuynge or disprouinge the reall presence of Christes very body in the holy Sacrament? or whereof doth this conclusion folow? of this, that he sayth, there is no man so mad, as to say that Christe was a naturall stone, is he so mad, as wolde haue it follow therefor?

HERE. No not so. CATH. Wherof then? HERE. He doth meane, that as Christ was called a stone, and was not a naturall stone indeede, so the Sacrament is called his body, and is not his naturall body indeede nother?

CATH. Well, this graunted, what is it to the purpose of the very presence of Christes blessed body in the sacrament? for that is it, whiche he goeth about, with all he can to disproue: will it folow that Christes blessed body is not really and verely in the Sacrament, because the Sacrament in respect of it self, is not his natural body? The question lieth vpon in, or not in. And Frith concludeth vpon is, or is not. As if I saye, my booke is in the Churche, he will proue the contrary by thys, that the Church is not my booke. Therfore because the churche is not my booke, is it not thereby well proued thinkest thou, that my booke is not in the Churche? because we

say, as the trewth is, that the very body of chriſt is in the ſacrament, he wil proue the contrary by this, that the ſacrament is not his very body. Blacke out of his booke, all thoſe concluſions, that be of this ſorte, and truſt me trewlie, thou ſhalt therin leaue but few or none behynde. For it is common with him, to make his aſſertion of one thinge, and his concluſion of an other. Whiche is good enoughe, to ſuch raſhe, light, wilfull, and ignorant heddes, as can no ſkill of the matter. For when they finde this, (his nedleſſe probation) trew, that the ſacrament is not the very body of Chriſte (as it is not indeede, in the bare reſpecte of it ſelfe) they take what ſo euer he ſayeth beſide, to be ſufficientlie proued in the ſame. For well knew he, that the meſſe parte, are farre from the knowledge and conſideration of the diſtinction and difference, that is betwene the Sacrament and the thinge of the Sacrament. Whereof the olde holy Fathers dothe ſay.

Aliud eſt Sacramentum, & aliud res Sacramenti.

That is to ſaye.

The Sacrament is one thynge. And the thynge of the Sacrament is an other.

And therfore becauſe the one ſomtime beareth the names of bothe, that is to ſay, the name of it ſelfe as it is, and alſo the name of the other, not as it ſelfe is, but as it is called, for good cauſe why, he thought, that as the Sacrament is called Chriſtes body, and yet is not hys very bodie indeede, ſo he thought as thou ſaydeſt before, that his body is ſayd to be therin, and yet is not verelye therin indeede. Wherfore as he thought the trew proufe of the one, ſhoulde be enough to colour hys falſe preten-

ded prouse of the other, so with the trewth of the same one, he wolde take away, not only the trewth of the other but also our verie profit of them bothe together. But whether he saw this muche him selfe or no, I can not perfitly tell. But of thys am I sure, that his folowers seeth it not, for if they dyd, they wolde not all, (I suppose) do as they do. And therfore when he sayth (as thou hast recited) that there is no man so madde, as to say, that Christe was a naturall stone, except he be a naturall foole, I wolde haue them all, for the truthe they haue in him, tell me how muche more, then a mad naturall foole was he to saye, that it is not dampnable so to thinke: which is farre worse, then so to say: for parchãce in some case, it may sometyme so be sayd, when in no case, at any time, it may so be thought, but most dampnably. HE. Pe but I pray you syr, where bothe Fryth so say? CATH. Dost thou not know, that in the. 59. leafe of his booke, he speaking of his beleefe in the Sacramente, hath these wordes?

The beleuing of this poinct (he sayeth) is of it selfe not dam-
nable, as it is not dampnable to thinke, that Christe is a
verie stone or a vine.

These wordes thou seest are plaine enough. For what difference is there betwene a very stone and a naturall stone, but vtterly none at all. And therfore what wicked wretche hath there bene harde of, so cursed that euer spake ante suche thinge of our Sauiour Christe? for what followeth therof but this, that it is not dampnable to thinke Christe to be worse, or not so good, as a dog? for a Dog in the dew order and dignitee of nature, is far better then a stone or a Tyne other. For a stone hath

but

but a bare, being without any life at all, where as a vine hath so muche, and a vegetable life also. But a Dogge hath not only beynge, as well as a stone, and a vegetable life, as well as a Vyne, but also a sensible lyfe, whych is farre passing them bothe. Wherfore, excepte thou be of that wilfull blindnes, whiche will say, as no man els wil that no life is better then life. Or a vegetable life, better then a sensible life, thou must needes graunte a Dog farre better then a very stone, or a vyne other. Therfore what soeuer is thought to be a very stone or a vine, must needes be thought to be worse, or not so good as a Dog. But thys wicked kaytife, sayth it is not dampnable, to thynke that Chryste is a verie stone or a vyne. Wherefore it doeth, and must needes folow thereof, that it is not dampnable to thynke that our Sauiour Chryste is worse, or not so good as a Dogge. O what a thyng is thys of hym, but suche an vnspeakable cursednes, as neuer was, nor yet is, to be harde of, if a man myght chose? But it is wyth hym, as the Gospell dooeth saye.

Ex abundantia cordis os loquitur, That to say.
Of the store of the harte, the mouthe dothe speake.

Therfore how cam this into his harte, but thorough the moste cruell subtill and wily blaste of the father of liars, and consequently the father of all Heretykes? How was it otherwise possible for hym this to say, but by that meane? And yet that, not withoute the holye permyssion of Goddes inscrutable prouidence, to the great and wonderfull shame of all those, that foloweth this cursed kaytyues opinion. To their shame, I saie, that euer they shoulde be of suche a wilfull blyndnesse,

nes, and therby so infortunat, as to be the folowers of suche a dampnable lyinge leader. And yet in this, their ineuitable shame, is offred vnto them (if they wyl take it) a wonderfull occasion of obteynyng the great mercie of God agayne. For what greater occasion of their returne vnto trewth againe, can they haue or imagin, then this their notable shame of folowing him, whose moste dampnable error is so great, and also manifest, that they them selfes are not able to defende, nor excuse it? It is none excuse that some of them dothe make, sayinge that Frithe might so say in some respect. For in what respect may anie man thynke, but dampnablie, that Christ is a very stone? who so euer thinketh him a very stone, can therin thinke him no better thinge. For a very stone, of him that so taketh it, can be thought no better then a verie stone, of what sorte or kinde so euer it be. Therfore, Frithe being found the authour of such a doctrine, what neede we anie farther trial of him, other in the holy scripture, or in the holy doctours other, when we haue suche a proufe of him, as this, his moste cursed saying is, that it is not dampnable to thinke that Christ is a very stone or a vyne? who wolde trust him in anie thinge els. Sithe we haue founde his falsehed so abominable in this?

Cap. 8.

HERE. Syr there may be more sayd herein for his defence then you wene. For ye fynde muche fault with the maner of his rectall of saynt Austen. And yet here you recite his wordes after suche a sorte your selfe, that ye will be sure to take that, where with, ye may make agaynst him, and leaue out that, whiche foloweth

and maketh for him. CAT. If that be trew, I pray thee first tell me this, why may not I do so with him, as well as he doth so with Saynt Austen? HERE. Where doth he so with Saynt Austen? CATH. If thou doest not perceue it all ready, thou shalt see it playne enough eare we parte. But firste tell me where I do so with hym? HERE. Mary syr in your recytall of those woordes of hys, where he sayeth.

, It is not dampnable to thynke, that Christ is a very stone
, or a vine.

For there ye leaue out these wordes folowinge, which he ioyneth vnto them sayinge,

, Because the litterall sense so sayth.

For these woordes dothe show the cause, why he speaketh those woordes before. And therfore I maruel why, you recite not these, as well as the other. CATH. Because the other without these, was enoughe to declare, what a blinde malicious Heretike he was: but yet neuerthelesse (sithe thou goest so farre) I will saye now more then I sayde before. For this brother of liers, was so set a worke by the father of liers, that where as he lied before, but vpon Saynte Austen, for to colour the falshed of his owne purpose, now here, for a farther cloke of the same, he lyeth also vpon the holy Scripture, whiche he falsely taketh to witnesse. For where fyndeth he any litterall sence, ye or mysticall sence other, in all holy Scripture, that sayth, it is not damnable to thinke that Christ is a very stone. HE. Loe here ye misse vnderstand him agayne, & take it far otherwise, then he dothe meane, for he doth meane, that the litteral sense doth say it is not damnable so to thinke, but he doth meane, that

the

the litterall sence doth say, that Christ is a very stone, & therfore he him self sayth it is not dampnable to thinke that Christ is so. CATH. Yet thou shalt not excuse his lie of the holy Scripture so. For where doth he fynd, that the litteral sense dothe saye, Christe is a very stone? HERE. Where Paule saythe.

Petra autem erat Christus. That is to saye. 1.cor.10
A stone was Christ.

CATH. Although there be a difference to say a stone was Christe, and to say (as Frith doth) a very stone was Christe, or Christe a verie stone, yet here, why more a stone was Christe, Then the stone was Christ? HERE. That is all one. CATH. Ye amonge Heretikes. For I thinke your tergiuersations, be neuer to seeke. For is it all one to say (a stone) and to say, the stone? when the one, is so generall, that it may be vnderstand of any stone. And the other so special, that it maketh relation to some certen stone, mentioned before or after? And therefore it is not all one to say. The stone was Christe and to say, A stone was Christ. For in signification (The) and (A) dothe here muche differ. Wherfore Frith dothe falsely Englishe the litterall sense (whiche is) the stone was Christe, with this that he sayth, a stone was Christ. For the one maketh playne relatiõ to the spirituall stone 1.cor.10
expressely mencioned of the Apostle him self immediatly before, & so doth not the other. Moreouer frithes falshed herin resteth not thus, but goeth farther & addeth vnto it this worde (very) saying christ is a very stone. Putting away by ỹ word vert, al ambiguite of sense, that might rise of this word a stone. Therfore he saying a very stone, what litteral sense in the scripture can there be founde,

that so sayth of Christe? Or what is there to be sayd for Frith herin, but that thou must needes confesse him a verie manifest liar, and that vpon the litteral sence of holy Scripture? HERE. Although there be no litteral sense that so sayth of the stone, yet the litterall sence sayth, euen so of the Wine, sayinge,

Iohñ. 15 Ego sum vitis væra. That is to say, I am a very vyne.

CATH. What maketh that for Frith? For although the litterall sense be so, of the Wyne, yet it is not so, of the stone. Neuertheless Frithe speaketh it of the stone, and not of the vyne. For he sayth.

» It is not dampnable to thinke, that Christ is a very stone,
» or a vyne.

And sayth not a very vine.

HERE. Yet ye may there perceiue by this worde (or) that he ment the same worde (very) of the vine, which he speaketh of the stone. CATH. Then, why doeth he, but only meane it, without any expression of it, where it is. And expresseth it, so playnly, where it is not? HERE. Because it may be vnderstande of the stone, as it is expressed of the vine. CATH. That is false. For although the litterall sense dothe say in the one place, a very vine, yet it nother dothe, nor can say, in the other place, a verie stone. HERE. Why so? CATH. Because the stone there, hath in it conteyned a particuler respect to that, whiche goeth before. And so hath not the vine, whiche is spoken in suche a generalitee, that it hath no respecte to any one vyne, more then to another. And therefore by this it may well appere, that falsely doth Frithe bring in, these two textes, of the stone, and the vine, to be one phrase of speache, without any difference. How be

it,

ſt, that dooth he, onely to thentent he myght there with-all, wrynge in, this text, This is my bodie, to be lyke-wyſe of the ſame ſorte, and of one maner of ſpeeche. Which hath from them both, a farre greatter difference, then they haue eache from other, whiche is not ſmall nother, when the one can not be trewly engliſhed with this article (A) ſeying a ſtone, nor the other with this woorde (The) ſeying the vyne. But in thoſe places (A) is proper to the vine, and (the) to the ſtone. As the very trew and perfite ſence of the letter in both places, doeth of neceſſitee requyre. Wherfore, thus mateſt thou ſee, how well Frith hath quyt him ſelfe, in his vnderſtandinge of the ſcripture hitherto, and of S. Auſten both.

Cap. 9.

HERETICVS. Ye but ſir, he hath not yet done, with the ſcripture, nor with Saint Auſten nother. In ſo much, that for a farther proofe of his vnderſtandyng of this text, This is my bodie, he doth in the 22. leafe of his booke, alledge Saynt Auſten againe, in theſe woordes.

Si autem flagitium aut facinus iubere videtur, figurata loquutio eſt. Niſi Manducaueritis (inquit) carnem filij hominis & biberitis eius ſanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Facinus vel flagitium videtur iubere. Figura eſt ergo præcipiens paſsioni dominicæ eſſe communicandum & ſuauiter atq; vtiliter in Memoria recondendum, quod pro nobis Caro eius crucifixa & vulnerata ſit. That is to ſay. When ſo euer the Scripture or Chriſte ſeemeth to commaunde any foule or wicked thinge, then muſt that text be

Aug. 3. li. doct. chriſtiana.

» be taken figuratiuelye, that is, it is a phrase, allegory,
» and maner of speakyng, and muste be vnderstande spi-
» rituallye, and not after the letter. Except (saith Christe)
» ye eate the flesh of the sonne of man, and drynke his
» blood, ye shall not haue lyfe in you. He seemeth (saith S.
» Austen) to commaund a foule and a wicked thynge. It is
» therfore a figure commaundyng vs to be partakers of his
» passion, and sweetely and profitably to prynte in our
» minde, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for vs.

Now haue you harde his allegacion of S. Austen, both in latine and also in Englishe. CATH. Therefore thou shalt here myne allegacion also of the same place of S. Austen againe: and then tel me how Frithes allegacion therof and mine, doth agre together. For S. Austens woordes be these.

» Si autem flagitium aut facinus videtur iubere, aut vti-
» litatem, aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata lo-
» quutio est. Nisi Manducaueritis (inquit) carnem
» filij hominis & sanguinem biberitis, non habebi-
» tis vitam in vobis. Facinus vel flagitium videtur
» iubere. Figura est ergo præcipiens passioni domini-
» cæ esse communicandum & suauiter atq; vtiliter re-
» condendum in Memoria, quod pro nobis Caro eius
» crucifixa & vulnerata sit. That is to say.

» If the Scripture seme to commaunde an euill or a wicked
» thinge, or forbid a profite or a good thinge, it is a figura-
» tiue speache. Except ye eate (he saith) the flesshe of the
» sonne of man and drynke his blood, ye shall not haue lyfe
» in you. Therfore it is a figure commaundinge vs to
» be partakers of his passion, and swetely and profitably
» to prynt in our memorie, that his flesh was crucified
» and wounded for vs.

Here thou mayest now perceiue plaine that Fryth hath not so many latine woordes, in his allegacion of S.

Austen

Auſten, as I haue in myne, and yet I haue fewer Engliſhe woordes in myne, then he hath in his, by a greate ſorte. HERE. How cummeth that to paſſe? CATH. Not without a falſhed of his parte, if thou marke it well. For where theſe fewe latyne woordes of S. Auſtens, Figurata loquutio eſt, are no more to ſay, but (as I haue ſayd) it is a figuratiue ſpeeche, Fryth doth Englyſhe them after this ſorte, ſaiyng.

"Then muſt that text be taken figuratiuely, that is, it is a phraſe, allegorie, and maner of ſpeakynge, and muſte be vnderſtande ſpiritually and not after the letter."

Haſt thou harde of any trew man, that wolde, or truly coulde, ſo turne thoſe latine woordes into Engliſhe as he doth? Doeſt thou not ſee, how his wily falſhed doth here, vnder pretence and colour of Engliſhinge S. Auſtens woordes, brynge in nothyng els, but his owne falſe phantaſticall expoſition of them, to make his diſciples beleue and thinke, that Saint Auſtens meanyng, was but accordyng to this, his owne falſe feynynge? what woordes hath Saynt Auſten here, that may be wreſted to this, whiche this falſe lyar doth ſay, it muſt be vnderſtande ſpiritually and not after the letter? where fyndeth he this ſame, not after the letter? therin lyeth all the matter, And therof here ſpeaketh S. Auſten nothinge at all. For he ſaith no more, but that this texte.

"Excepte ye eate the fleſhe of the ſonne of man, and drinke his blood, ye ſhall not haue lyfe in yow."

Is a figuratiue ſpeache. And dooeth not ſaye, onely figuratiue, or not litterall, as this marchaunt doothe beare vs in hande, and woulde make vs beleue

that

that he dooth. HERE. Yet sir, if it bee a figuratiue speche, then must it be vnderstand figuratiuely. CAT. That is trew. HE. Therfore if it must be vnderstand figuratiuely, then it may not be vnderstand litterally. CATH. That foloweth not. For Fryth him felfe doth graunt and say, (as I tolde the before) that some texte must be vnderstand both figuratiuely, and also litterally. And therfore why may not this, which Frith speaketh of, be one of them? as it may in deed, for any thing that Saint Austen saith here to the contrary? And yet as though S. Austen had said the contratry, (as he doth not) this false Raynard is not ashamed to knit vp the knot with these woordes.

» This trewth (saith he) thankes be to god, doth Saint Au-
» sten declare vnto vs. which thinge besyde the openynge
» of this text, against maister Moores minde, doth plainly
» show, what he thought in the woords of Christes supper.

Whiche is no more to say, but that those woordes maie not be vnderstande after the letter, because here, Saint Austen telleth vs nothing of that matter, whether they may or not. Therfore doth not Saint Austen declare this trewth vnto vs very well, when he speaketh nothing of it? HERE. Sir, if it might be vnderstande, both figuratiuely and also litterally to, S. Austen wold not haue made mention (as he dooth) of the one sense, and not of the other. CATH. How knowest thou that? HERE. It is most like so? CATH. Ye to Frith. And therfore that is enough to him, to conclude so falsely therof as he doth. But thou muste vnderstande, that it was not Saint Austens minde there to speake of any of them both, that is to saye, nother of the one sense, nor of the other, but as it chaunsed the one

and

& not the other, to serue his purpose for example of that he had in hande, whiche was to geue a rule, whereby a figuratiue speach in the scripture might be knowen. And not to discusse how or whether that text might bee litterally vnderstande or not. And therefore, graunt this to be trew, which Fryth doeth here say that Saint Austen.

Doth plainly show, what he thought in those woordes of christes supper.

Yet it foloweth not thereof, that he dooth showe all, that he thought therin. For it is two thinges to show what he thought, and to showe all that he thought.

HERE. Marry syr that is trew, but Fryth, for the openynge thereof, dooeth alledge him agayne in these woordes.

Cap. 3.

CATH. Nay softe I praie thee, let vs fyrste here what Frithe sayth more of this place, whiche he hath here alledged all ready, before we go anye farther. For he hath yet showed vs almost nothyng, what he gathereth of it, after his owne mynde, but onely his false exposicion thereof, brought in (as I sayde) vnder the colour of Englishyng of Saint Austens woordes. Therfore let me here what he saith farther of it him selfe, without any cloke or colour at all. HERE. That shall ye do. For immediately after this his saiyng, that S. Austen doth plainly show, what he thought in the woordes of Christes supper, he addeth vnto it these woordes.

For sith he called it (saith Frith) a foule and a wicked thing

» to eate his flesshe, then may you soone perceiue, that he » thought it as foule and as wicked a thinge, to eate his bo» dy, seyng his bodie is flesshe. And then consequently it shall » folow, that other this woorde, eate (where Christe saide, » take this and eate it) must be taken spiritually, or els that » this saiyng of Christe. This is my body, muste be figu» ratiuely spoken. But this woorde, eate, is taken after » the letter (for they did in deede eate the bread) therfore it » must needes folow, that this sentence (This is my body) » must be figuratiuely spoken.

Now haue you heard what he saieth and gathereth of it him selfe. CATH. Thou saiyst trew. And therfore shall I needs to byd thee marke his faise lye, that he maketh here agayne of Saint Austen: For doth Saint Austen call it a fowle and a wicked thynge (as this lyar sayth he doothe, when he sayth no more but that the scripture therin seemeth to commaunde an euyll or a wicked thyng: Saint Austen nother calleth it so him selfe, nor yet doth say, that the scripture calleth it, or commaundeth it so nother. He saith the scripture seemeth to commaunde suche a thynge. And doth not say, the scripture doth commaunde it. But in deede to commaunde, and seme to commaunde, to call, and seme to cal, or to be, & seeme to be, is all one with frith. As who say there is nothing otherwyse then it semeth to be, nor any thyng semeth to be, otherwise then it is. HER. Sir ye can not auoyde his argument so. CATH. His argument: what is that? HER. Ye haue harde how he dooeth say, that

» Either this word eate (which Christ said, take this & eate » it) must be taken spiritually, or els that this saiynge of » Christ, This is my body, must be figuratiuely spoken. But » this woorde eate (saith he) is taken after the letter, for they

did

did (he saieth) eate the bread, therfore it must needes follow that this sentence (This is my body) must be figuratiuely spoken.

CATHOLICVS. I mervayle where frythe learned this kynde of argumente, whiche can bringe forth such a woorthy conclusion. For dooth it not properly folow, that this sentence (This is my body) muste be figuratiuely taken, because (as he saith) this woorde eate, is taken after the letter? And this he doothe but say, without any proofe at all. HARE. That is not so. For he doth proue, that this woorde (Eate) is taken after the letter: CATH. That is but a parte of it, and yet (for all thy saying) he proueth not that neyther. HARE. Yes, he proueth it by this, that (as he saith) they did eate the bread. CATH. Ye but that I denye. For without question they dyd eate that, which they were byd to eate, wherof, it was to them sayde, Take eate, This is my body, whiche shalbe geuen for you. And that was not breade, except thou wilt say, that bread was geuen for their redemption. And therfore, where he saith, that this woorde bread, is taken after the letter, And thereof would haue it folow, that this sentence, This is my body, muste be figuratiuely spoken, I aske him why figuratiuely, more then lytterally, or why figuratiuelie, and not rather litterally? For if the woorde of eatynge, be taken after the letter, dooth it not thereof muche better folowe that the woordes of that whiche is eaten, shulde be taken after the letter likewise? To take the woord of eatynge, in a litteral sence, and therfore the woordes of the thyng eaten, in a figuratiue sence, is more strange then I can skil of.

yet the one (saieth he) must needes folow the other. But by what reason, although no man can tell, yet to such as will needes beleue him, it is good enough, although it be neuer so false and foolishe to any man els.

And therefore lith it appereth in the .47. leafe of his booke, that he taketh not the eatynge of Christes body, but onely for the beleuynge in him, I aske him, why may not this woord (Eate) be taken spiritually, as well as this text, This is my body, be spoken figuratiuely? or why may not the same text be taked litterally, as wel as this woorde (Eate) be taken after the letter, lith they be so ioyned together? HERE. Because there is a great difference betweene them. CATH. Ye that is, as Frith would haue vs take them, but not as our Sauiour Christe in the vnitee of sente and sentence together doth ioyne them. For there is no doubte, but the meanynge of this woorde Eate, and also the meanynge of this same saiynge of Christe, This is my bodye, are bothe together of him so inseperably knit and conteyned in this one sentence.

Iohn.6, Except ye eate the flesthe of the sonne of man, and drynke his blood, ye shall not haue life in you.

That they both maketh one perfit sentence and sence, whether thou take it to be litterall or spirituall. And therfore by this one lesson aforesayde, it maye well appere, that they can not so differ in sence, but that they muste other be bothe spirituall, and not litterall, or bothe litterall and not spirituall, or els bothe not onely spirituall, but also litterall. Wherefore, Frythe can not saye, that they be bothe spirituall and not litterall, because he sayeth the one of

them

them, that is to saie, this woorde Eate, is taken after the letter. Agayne, he can not say, that they are both litterall, and not spirituall, because he doothe both holde and say, that the other which is, This is my body, must be taken figuratiuely, that is to say spiritually. And therfore it must needes folow, that they be bothe, not only spirituall, but also litterall.

Cap. vi.

HERE. Yet that can not be. For as I was about to tell you before, Frithe bringeth Saynt Austen playne agaynst it. CATH. How so? HERE. Looke you in the .23. leafe of hys booke, and there shall ye finde how he doothe alledge Saynt Austen, bothe in Latin and also in English in theise woordes.

Quando loquebatur dominus noster Iesus Christus, de corpore suo, Nisi (Inquit) quis manducauerit carnem meam et biberit sanguinem meum, non habet in se vitam. Caro enim mea vere est cibus, et Sanguis meus vere est potus. Intellectus spiritualis credentem saluum facit, quia littera occidit, Spiritus est qui viuificat. That is to say.

When our Lorde Jesus Christe spake of his body, excepte (quod he) a man eate my flesshe and drinke my blood, he shall haue no life in him selfe. For my flesshe is very meat, and my blood is very drinke. The spirituall understanding saueth him that beleueth, for the letter killeth, but the spirit quickeneth.

Here you see playne, that Saynt Austen is clearly against the litterall sense. CATH. Whether he be or not, it is Frithes minde therein, whyche I require. HE. What shall ye haue, for his owne woordes vpon the same

place be these.

„ Were maye you playnelie perceiue (sayth he) that thys text
„ must only be taken spiritually. For he sayth, to take it af-
„ ter the letter, it killeth, and profiteth nothing at all.
„ And therfore I wonder that we haue bene ledde so longe
„ in this grosse errour.

CATH. And I wonder that Frithe was ledde so long in this grose blyndnesse, that he wolde wade so farre as he did, vpon a figuratiue sense, before he had made it certayne, in what respecte it is figuratiue. That is to say, whether it be figuratyue in respect of the very mere essenciall substance of the thinge, or els in some other respect parteyning as it were to the same, or to the vse therof. HERE. Syr I suppose this is but an inuented euasion of you, to shake of the matter and nothinge els. For here Saynt Austen sayth playne, that the letter killeth. And that he wolde not say, if there were any litterall sense in it. CATH. Then syth thou takest it so, although we might doubt of Frithes allegation herin, because he showeth not where Saynt Austen dothe speake those woordes, but by this note in the margent of his booke (August. in sermo. ad infantes) whithe sermon, I haue not seene, nor no more (as I thinke) did Frithe nother, yet to graunt him no lesse, but that they be the wordes of saynt Austen indeede, Thou shalt here, how Saynt Austen doth speake them him self, where I haue red them in an other place. For vpon the title of the. 33. Psalme, where he sayeth.

„ Quando loquebatur dominus noster Iesus Christus
„ de corpore suo, (Ait) Nisi quis manducauerit carnem
„ meam et biberit sanguinem meũ, non habebit in se vi-

tam,

tam. Caro mea vere est esca, et Sanguis meus vere potus est.

There, in that place folowth immediatly these wordes. Et discipuli eius qui eum sequebãtur expauerunt. &c.

And not these wordes.

Intellectus spiritualis credentem saluum facit, quia littera occidit, Spiritus est qui viuificat.

Which Frith addeth vnto them, and placeth them there of his owne hed. How be it, I will not deny, but that Saynt Austen hath those wordes, but where? in verie deede not there, where Frithe doth place them. But iiii. or. v. lines before, cleane to an other purpose, then Frith wolde here make vs beleue, that Saynt Austen speketh them for. And therfore what a parte he playeth in that, iudge him now thy selfe. HERE. Yea, parchance Saint Austen hath in some other place, all those woordes together in the same order as Frith doth here alledge them. CATH. Graunt that to be trew, and yet it can not proue Frithes purpose for all that. HERE. What, not when Saynt Austen doth say, that in those wordes of Christ, the letter killeth? CATH. No trewly. For although it be trew, that the letter killeth, yet there may be therein, (as there is) a litteralt sense for al that. HE. Then it killeth? CATH. No, not so nother. HERE. How proue you that? CATH. I will leaue all other proufes, and proue it euen by Saynt Austen him selfe. HE. Nay then, if you proue that by S. Austen, I will tell you an other maner of tale, then ye looke for. CATH. What so euer thou wilt tell, I tell thee, that vpon the title of the sayde. 33. Psalme, S. Austen speaking there of the prophet Dauid, as the story compelleth him to do, doth say these wordes.

Et

» Et ferebatur in manibus suis. Hoc vero fratres quo-
» modo possit fieri in homine quis intelligat? Quis e-
» nim portatur in manibus suis? Manibus aliorum po-
» test portari homo. Manibus suis nemo portatur. Quo
» modo intelligatur in ipso David secundum literam,
» non inuenimus. In Christo autem inuenimus. Fereba-
» tur enim Christus in manibus suis. Quando commē-
» dans ipsum corpus suum ait. Hoc est corpus meū.
» Ferebat enim illud corpus in manibus suis.

That is to saye.

» He was borne in his owne handes. But brethern how this
» may be done in a man, who can understande? for who is
» borne in his owne hands? A man may be borne in the han
» des of other. But in his owne handes no man is borne.
» How it may be understande in David hym selfe after the
» letter, we do not finde. But we finde it in Christe. For
» Christe was borne in his owne handes, when he setting
» furth the same his owne bodie sayth, this is my bodie. For
» he bore that bodie in his owne handes.

Here it can not be auoyded, but euen by Saynt Au-
sten, these wordes of Christe, This is my body, must
needes haue a litterall sense. HERE. That is not so.
For although Saynt Austen, dothe here say, that christ
was borne in his owne handes, when he sayde, This is
my body, yet it foloweth not, but that he mente he bare
hym selfe in his own handes figuratiuely, and (as Frith
sayeth) not litterally or after the letter. CATH. Wilt
thou be there? dothe not Saint Austen here playnly say,
that he findeth the same in Christe, whiche he findeth
not in David? And this (he sayeth) he findeth not in Da-
uid, how it may be understande that he was borne in his
owne handes after the letter. Wherfore it must needes

folow, that he findeth how it may be vnderſtand in thꝛiſt that he was bozne in his owne handes after the letter, when he layd, This is my body. And therevpon dothe Saynt Auſten reſt. Foꝛ otherwiſe, he myght haue founde it in Dauid, but (as he layeth) not after the letter. And therfoꝛe after the letter he fyndeth it in Chriſte. Now therefoꝛe tell me where is Frithes denyall of this litterall ſenſe becum, ſithe he is therin, thus cleane ouerthꝛowne, and that by the playne woꝛdes of Saynt Auſten hym ſelfe, whome he falſelye boſteth to make ſo muche and clerely foꝛ hym: when the trewth is, he maketh directlie agaynſt him.

Cap. 12.

HERE. Syꝛ ye heare not yet, what Frythe dothe farther ſaie, vnto it. CATH. It ſhall not ſkill what ſo euer he ſay, agaynſt ſo playne a trewth as this is. Speciallye when agaynſt trewth, can nothinge be bꝛought but falſhed. HERE. Yet me thinke you ſhould here him, as wel in the reſt, as in this that is paſte, befoꝛe ye giue any iudgement thereof. Foꝛ he taketh vpon him to pꝛoue, that Saynt Auſten, doth not here ſo meane, as ye vnderſtande him. CATH. Peraduenture he taketh it ſo vpon him, foꝛ it is moꝛe eaſier to take it vpon him twiſe, then to do it once. HERE. Yet perchaunce ye ſhall ſee him do it indeede. CATH. Whiche way? HERE. Euen by Saynt Auſten hym ſelfe. CATH. That wolde I heare. HERE. In the .84. leafe, of hys booke theſe be his owne woꝛdes.

» The text of Saynt Austen (sayth he) whiche they there al-
» ledged against me was this, that in the Sacrament, christ
» was borne in his owne handes, where vnto I sayde, that
» Saynt Austen doth full well expounde him selfe. For in
» an other place he sayth. Ferebatur tanquam in manibus suis.
» That is, he was borne after a certayne maner in his owne
» handes. And by that he sayth after a certayne maner, ye
» may sone perceyue what he meaneth.

Now haue ye harde what Frithe sayeth of Saynt Austen agayne. CATH. Thou sayest treuth. And thereby doo I well perceyne him to folow more that, whiche he hath in thys poynte harde of Saynt austen by other, then that whiche he hath seene of sayne Austen him selfe. And that appereth not only by this, that he maketh here no mention of anie speciall place of Saynt Austen, where those wordes should be, but also by this, that in the place, where I haue redde Saynt Austen concerninge the same. That is to say, vpon the title of the. 33 Psalme, hys very wordes be these.

» Ferebatur in manibus suis. Quomodo ferebatur in
» manibus suis? quia cum commendaret ipsum corpus
» suũ & sanguinem suum, accepit in manus suas, quod
» norunt fideles, et ipse se portabat quodammodo eum
» diceret. Hoc est corpus meum. That is to say.
» He was borne in his owne handes. How was he borne in
» his owne handes? because when he did set furth the same
» his owne bodie, and his bloud, he tooke that into his han-
» des, whiche the faythfull doeth know. And he bore hym
» selfe after a certayne maner, when he sayde, this is my
» bodie.

These be the woordes of Saynt Austen in that place whyche I haue red. And although it be no greate matter, yet there is no suche, tanquam in manibus

bus suis, as Frithe dothe here speake of. Therefore if he him selfe saw and red this place of Saynt Austen, and wolde not (as he dothe not) alledge the woordes of it as they be, iudge thou what a parte he playeth in that. Of the other side, if he saw them not hym self in S. Austen, but tooke them (as I beleue he did) oute of some heretikes booke, to colour his false purpose with al, how foolish was he to thinke, that it wolde neuer be spied? HERE. Syr all this, is but a voyde draught. For in the woordes whiche ye do here recite of Saynt Austen your selfe, appereth enoughe for Frithes purpose, and as muche as he requireth. CATH. What is that? HERE. This that Saynt Austen sayth.

Christe bore hym selfe in his owne handes after a certayn maner, when he sayd, thys is my body.

For by thys that he sayth after a certayne manner, ye may lone perceyue (sayeth Frythe) what he meaneth. CATH. After a certayne maner? indeede it is to vs after a certayne maner, that Frithe doeth alway make his conclusion, vpon an incertayne grounde, although it be to him, after his common maner. For what is the cause that he doth not first make it certaine, what Saynt Austen meaneth by this, that he sayth, after a certayne maner? HERE. Frithe sayeth ye may perceaue what he meaneth. CATH. Ye, we maye, and do, but yet why dothe not Frithe expresse the meaning of it, least he take it one way, and we an other? HERE. He doeth expresse it in the same place immediatlie folowynge, and that in these woordes, sayinge.

, How be it, if Saynt Austen had not thus expounded hym
, selfe, yet he sayth, Ad bonifacium, that the Sacrament of
, a thynge hath a similitude of the thynge, whiche it signi-
, fieth. And for that cause, it hath many tymes, the name
, of the very thynge whiche it signifieth. And so he sayeth,
, that he bore hym selfe, because he bore the Sacrament of
, his body and bloud.

CATH. And wel sayd. Is this the bering of hymself in his owne hands after ỳ certaine maner, which S. Austen meaneth, to beare the similitude or sacramẽt of him self in his owne handes? HE. What els? CAT. Then, where is the bering of him self in his owne hands after the letter? S. Austen saith (as I sayd before) he bare him self in his owne handes after the letter. But to bere the similitude or sacrament of him self in hys owne handes, is not to bere him self in his owne handes after the letter. For there, the letter maketh no mention of any similitude or sacrament other. Wherfore if S. Austen had mente by this that he sayeth, after a certayne maner, none other but that Christe bore the similitude of hym selfe, in hys owne handes, when he sayd, This is my body, he myght sone haue founde, how that might haue bene as wel vnderstanded in Dauid, as in Christ. Therfore it was not that, whiche he ment, when he sayd, he founde not howe it might be vnderstand in Dauid after the letter. For Dauyd might haue borne the similitude of hym selfe in hys owne handes. Wherfore thys that Saynt Austen sayeth, Christe bare hym selfe in hys owne handes, after a certayne maner, can be no exposition (as Frithe wolde haue it to be) of thys that he sayeth, Chryste bore hym selfe in hys owne handes after the letter. For no more, can this nother, that he sayeth.

Sacra-

Sacramentes haue a certaine ſimilitude of thoſe things, whereof they are ſacramentes, and ofte tymes of that ſimilitude take the names of the thynges them ſelues.

When the letter (as I ſayde) maketh there no mencion of any ſimilitude or ſacrament other. HERE.

Then is this that Saint Auſten ſaith, Chriſte bore him ſelfe in his owne handes after a certaine maner, can be no expoſicion of this that he ſaith, Chriſte bore him ſelfe in his owne handes after the letter, doubtles thoſe two ſaiynges can not be bothe trew nor ſtand together.

Cap. 13.

CATH. If thou or Frith other, take S. Auſten after that maner, doubtles ye are both deceiued in him, after a wicked maner. For what is after a certaine maner, but not after a commune maner? As when our ſauiour Chriſte appeered vnto certaine of his diſciples in the way goyng to Emaus after his reſurrection, either he appeered vnto them after his common maner, or els after a certaine maner. If he had apeered vnto them after his common maner, they had then knowne, it had bene he, whiche (as the goſpell doth ſey) they did not in deede. Wherefore he apeered vnto them, not after his common maner, but after a certayne maner, whiche was ſuche, as by reaſon whereof, they knew him not, as it doth there, right well apeere. Againe of the other ſyde, his apparence alſo vnto them then, was other after the letter, or els not after the letter. If thou ſaie it was not after the letter, then thou denyeſt both his very beyng with them then, and alſo the letter is, whiche doth ſay. Luc. 14.

Jesus him selfe drawinge nere, went with them.

Therefore if thou say that he apeered vnto them after the letter (as the trewth is, he did in deede) then thou must needes grant, that he apered vnto them there, not after a common maner, but bothe after a certayne maner, and also after the letter to, and that bothe at once. And why therefore saiest thou, that Saynt Austens saiynge of Christes bearyng him selfe, in his owne handes after the letter, and his saiynge that he bore him selfe in his owne handes after a certaine maner, can not stand together, when thou maiest thus perceiue that after the letter, and after a certayne maner, doothe well agree and stande together, in the gospell?

HERETI. Yet for me thynke by you, that after the letter, and after a certayne maner, are not bothe one, but haue some differens betweene them. CATHOLICVS. Trew it is. How be it no surthe, but that they maie and dooe stande together well enoughe. For after the letter, is here sayde, in respect of the very reall and essentiall beyng of his substaunce. And after a certayne maner, is sayde in respect of the straunge forme, wherein he apeered vnto them. HERETICVS. Ye but when he bore him selfe in his owne handes (as Sainte Austen saith) after a certaine maner, there was no such strange forme appeerynge then. CATH. Yes euen so strange, as when he by the way shewed him selfe to the two disciples. For then he shewed him selfe in the forme of a mā which forme coulde not be straunge, but wel known,

in

in that reſpect, what it was. Therfore the ſtraungnes was not in that, but in this, that he ſhewed him ſelfe in the fourme of an other maner of man, whiche was no man in deede, but he him ſelfe ſo in it, as though he had not beene therein. And therfore the fourme is ſayde to be ſtrainge, becauſe it was of him ſo ſtranigly vſed. Wherefore lykewyſe, when he bore hym ſelfe in his owne handes after a certayne maner, he bore him ſelfe in the fourme of bread, whiche fourme, to anie man coulde not bee ſtraunge, but well knowen what it was. Therfore the ſtraingnelle was not in that, but it was in this, that he bare him ſelfe in the fourme of breadde, whiche was no breadde in deede, but he him ſelfe ſo in the fourme thereof, as thoughe he had not beene therein. And therefore the fourme, male alſo there, be ſayde to bee ſtraynge becauſe it was, as dayly it is, of him ſo ſtraingely vſed. wherefore as he, to the two diſciples, ſhowed him ſelfe after a certayne maner, that is to ſaie, not in his owne proper fourme, but in the fourme of an other maner of manne, whyche made him therein ſo ſtraynge vnto theim then, ſo he bore him ſelfe in his owne handes after a certayne maner, that is to ſaie, not in his owne proper fourme, but in the fourme of an other maner of thynge, whiche maketh him therin ſo ſtraynge now vnto them, that bee vnfaithfull. For as Saynt Auſten ſaieth of it in manie places, Norunt fideles, The faythfull knowth him therein well enoughe, he is not ſtraynge therein

to

to them. For he that can vse him selfe vnder one fourme, more then is proper or naturall vnto him, And that without the crafte, arte, or helpe of man, I doubte not, but that he can vse him selfe vnder an other and mo formes, or vnder as many as he will. As it may well appeere by that he showed him selfe, as is aforesaid to the two disciples in the fourme of a trauailer by the waie. And to Mary magdalen in the fourme of a gardiner. Also an other tyme, to three of his disciples, in the fourme of a glorified bodye. Wherefore he dyd none of these, after a common maner, but after a certain maner. Yet this same certaine maner, neither dooth, nor yet can take away, the very reall and substantiall presence of the vsare thereof, or haue any beyng it selfe, where the vsare thereof is not, or force anye good and trew vnderstandynge, that the vsare of it shoulde not euen be there, with it or in it. For it doothe but onelye showe how dyuersly, he can behaue him selfe in his apparence, and denieth not therein his presence. By this therfore it maie well appere (as I saide before) that this sayinge (After a certaine maner) and this saiyng (after the letter) maie well agree, and stande both together. As good reason, and therample thereof whiche I haue recited vnto thee of the holy gospell, dooth plainely declare. For the trewth to say, (as the trewth is in deede) those two sayinges of Saynt Austen are not spoken, but in these diuers respectes. The one (as I sayde) in respect of the very substantiall beynge of the thynge it selfe, whereof it is spoken. And the other, in respecte of the Accidentall fact or behauiour of the same. Therefore when S. Austen saith, Christe bore him selfe in his owne

Luc. 24
Iohñ. 20
Mat. 17.

owne handes after the letter, the very vnderſtandynge therof apperteyneth onely to the reall and ſubſtanciall preſence of Chriſtes very body in the ſacramente, nothinge touching any accidentall qualitees or occult behauiour thereof, but the verite of the ſubſtaunce onely. And when he ſaith, Chriſte bore him ſelfe in his owne handes after a certayne maner, the trewe meanynge of that apperteineth only to the very ſecret and inſenſible behauiour of it in the ſacrament, and not to the ſubſtance wherin that inuiſible behauiour is. And beſide this, how farre from all doubte of this vnderſtandyng, doth Saint Auſten expreſſe the matter him ſelfe, in his woordes before alledged? where he ſaith.

Chriſte was borne in his owne handes, when he ſettynge forth the ſame his owne body, ſayth, This is my body. For he bore that body in his owne handes.

HERE. Be what body? CATH. The ſame his owne body (ſaith Saint Auſten) or the ſelfe ſame body of his, chooſe the whether. For ſo theſe woordes, Ipſum corpus ſuum, male or muſt needes be Engliſhed, and no way els more trewly. Wherefore theſe woordes of Saint Auſten can not be applyed, to any ſigne, ſimilitude, or ſacrament other, but directly to the very ſubſtance of the thing that he ſpeaketh of, which is the bleſſed body of Chriſt. And that ſpecially when he addeth vnto it, and ſaith, he bore that body in his owne handes. He ſaith not a body, as incertaine which, but he ſpeaketh certeinly and ſaith, that body, wherof he dooth playnely treat. And that appeereth alſo in the other place, where he ſaith.

He bore him ſelfe after a certaine maner.

For what so euer that maner of bearyng was, yet him selfe, can be none other but him selfe. Saint Austen saith, he bore him selfe. And there is nother signe, similitude, or sacrament of him, that is, or can be properly said, to be him selfe. For this worde, him selfe, or it selfe, hath none other respect, but alway and only, to the very reall and substanciall being of him or it, wherof it is directly spoken. Wherfore this that S. Austen saith.

, Christe bore him selfe in his own handes after the letter.

Serueth onely to conuince them, that denieth the very real presēce of Christs blessed body in the holy sacrament. And this that he saith.

, He bore him selfe after a certaine maner.

Serueth onely to helpe and amende the blindenesse of them, that considereth none other but onely suche common maner of bearyng and beyng, as their owne outwarde deceiuable sences, dayly dremeth vpon, whereby they are drawne to such wonder at the matter, that they thinke it to straunge, to beleue therin, as the holy Catholyke churche dothe teache. And all bicause this bearyng that S. Austen speaketh of, is not common, but after an other certaine maner, then their blinde phantastical dreming of sensible thinges, can, may, or is able, to reach vnto. And therefore therin to holde and kepe them stylle, Frith doth labour and trauayle with his wringyng and wrestyng of this same certaine maner, to such an vnderstanding, as nother the worde of S. Austen, nor yet any reason, authoritee, or learning, can beare or suffer. For he, thorow lacke of puttinge any difference betwene the thing done, and the maner of the doing, doth so confound them together, that with his handlyng of the one, he de-

ceiueth

reueth him selfe and many mo, in the trewth of theim bothe. But such was his lacke, not onely of learninge, but muche moze of grace. Foz it is two thinges to teach what was done, whereof S. Austen saith, Christ boze him selfe in his owne handes after the letter.

And to teach how oz after what maner it was doone, wherof S. Austen saith no farther, but that it was done after a certaine maner, of which certaine maner, here he declareth no farther, because (as he doth trewly say) the veritee of the thyng, the faythfull doth know. And therfoze because he declareth here no farther thereof, Frith of his owne head, taketh vpon him to do it him selfe, after his heretical maner. Whom if we could beleue, we might thynk our sauiour Christe no better then a very stone, without (as he sayth) any parell of damnation at all. Wherefoze if thou hast marked well, what I haue hitherto sayd, thou maist easely perceiue how soolishe and false his vnderstandyng of Saynt Austen is.

Cap. 14.

HERE. That is to be weyed as we synde him in theende. Foz he hath mo places of S. Austen foz his purpose then these. And specially one, whiche passeth all that ye haue herde of him yet, and directly against the place of the. 33. psalme, whiche you haue alledged. CATH. Which one is that? HERE. In the 27. leafe of his booke, he dothe alledge Saint Austen both in latine and in Englishe also, after this sozte, saiyng that Saint Austen saith.

Non hoc corpus quod videris, estis manducaturi, nec bibituri

» bibituri illum ſanguinem quem effuſuri ſunt qui me
» crucifigent.
» Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendaui, ſpiritua-
» liter intellectum viuificat vos, caro autem non prod-
» eſt quicquam. That is to ſay,
» You ſhall not eate this body that you ſee, nor drinke that
» blood which they that crucifi me, ſhall ſhed out. I haue
» geuen a certaine ſacrament vnto you, if it be ſpiritually
» vnderſtand, it quickneth you, But the fleſh profiteth no-
» thinge.

Now ſir, of this, Frith doth aſke this queſtion.

» What thinges can be more plainely ſpoken?

CATH. And I aſke of him agayne, what thinges can be more falſely vnderſtande, then he doth vnderſtande them? for if he had vnderſtand them trewly, or bene willyng ſo to do, he might and wolde, as well alledged S. Auſt. in theſe words, which he hath no farther from that place, then in the very ſelfe ſame leafe, where he ſaith of our ſauiour Chriſte.

Pſal. 92. Suſcepit enim de terra, terram. Quia caro de terra
» eſt. Et de carne Mariæ carnem accepit. Et quia in ipſa
» carne hic ambulauit, & ipſam carnem nobis mandu-
» candam ad ſalutem dedit, Nemo autem illam carnem
» manducat niſi prius adoraueri, inuentum eſt quem-
» admodum adoretur tale ſcabellum pedum domini.
» That is to ſaie, He toke earth of earth, becauſe fleſhe is of
» earth. And of the fleſhe of Mary he toke fleſh. And becauſe
» he walked here in the ſame fleſhe, and for our helth hath
» geuen vnto vs the ſame fleſhe to eate, but no man doth
» eate that fleſh, except he honour it before, it is found how
» ſuche a foote ſtoole of our Lorde, ſhould be honoured.

Now, although it doth not here (for lacke of that, which goeth before) euen euidently apere, why S. Auſten doth chiefly ſpeake theſe words, yet may I ſay of this place, the

the same, and as well as Frithe dothe saye of the other, what thinges can be, more playnely spoken? More playnly spoken I say, as touching the veritee of Christes owne blessed flesh and blood in the holy Sacrament? For is it not here, most playnly expressed of Saynt Austen, that Christe for our healthe hath geuen vnto vs the same flesh to eate, wherin he walked here in earth? And where did he so giue vs that to eate, but in the holy sacrament? Therefore what coulde Saynt Austen saye more to the very playnesse of the matter, if a man had asked him purposely, how he did beleue therein, or what his faith was in that behalfe? HERE. May then, if Saynt Austen can handle the matter after suche a sorte, as of the other side, in the parson of Christ to say.

You shall not eate thys body, that you se, nor drynke that
bloud whiche they that crucifie me, shall shed out. And far-
ther say, I haue geuen a certayne sacrament vnto you, yf
it be spiritually vnderstande, it quickeneth you. But the
flesshe profiteth nothinge.

If Saynt Austen (I say) can handle the matter so, that he will speake so playnly of bothe sides, and make for eache parte, beinge so contrary as Frithes opinion and yours is, truste him who will, for so wyll I neuer from hence forth. CATH. Perchaunce no more thou hast done hetherto. HERE. Yes that I haue alway till now. CATH. So wolde Frithe say for his parte, if he were to answere therin. And yet I dare say, he trusted him, no farther then he thought he should make for his purpose. And (as it appereth) no more doest thou, nor any of you all. HERE. Why say you so? for as touching Frithe, I am well assured that he trusted Saynt Austen aboue all men, as it dothe by his owne wordes euident-

ſle appere. CATH. If he had ſo done in deede, as he did falſely ſo pretende, he wolde not alledged the one of theſe forſayd places, and lefte the other behinde as he doeth, being ſo nere together in one leafe as of ſome volume they are in deede, but wolde alledge them both and made ſome conference betwene them of their agrement, if he had truſted Saynt auſten as wel in the one, as he did in the other. How be it becauſe he ſaw the one place, make ſo playnely with our belefe, that he coulde call there vpon no colour to the contrary, he left out that, and brought forthe the other, whiche as he thought might ſeeme, to make only for his purpoſe altogether. Wherefore this came not of any truſt that he had in Saynt Auſten in deede, but of the truſt he had in his owne falſe and wylie handlinge of ſome certayne places of Saynt Auſten, to deceaue hys diſciples withal, wherof he choſe this place, whiche thou haſt alledged to be one. For if he had truſted Saynt Auſten as he pretended to doo, he wolde haue truſted him as well in the one of theſe places, as in the other, where as now it is playne, he truſted him in none of them bothe or at the leaſt, miſtruſted him in the one, and onwares, or wilfully, wolde miſtake him in the other. HERE. Why ſyr, wolde he haue hym truſt Saynt Auſten in bothe places, when they be ſo repugnant, and ſo contrary one againſt an other, that they can, by no reaſon, ſtande nor agree together? CATH. What be they? HERE. Euen as I tell you. CATH. Thynkeſt thou Saynt Auſten beinge a man of ſuche witte, of ſuch learning, of ſuche holineſſe, and therfore of ſuche moſte excellent fame thorow all chriſtendome ſo many hun-

dred

dred yeares, to be one of that sorte, that in so weyghtie a matter, forgetteth to day, what he sayde yesterday: or wyll say one thinge now, and to morrowe the contrary: or in his writynge ouershotte hym selfe in one sentence, before an other be drie: For doubtlesse, these two sayinges are placed so nere together, that I beleue the one was not drie, before theother was written. Therefore how madde a phansy were it, so to thinke of Saynt Austen, that these two places are contrarie, and one agaynst an other: HERE. Why, who can take them otherwise, the wordes beinge so playne: for doth he not say in the one place,

Christ hath geuen vs the same flesshe to eate, wherein he walked here in earthe.

And in the other place.

You shall not eate this body that you see:

And what is this, but eate and not eate one thinge both at once, whiche is not possible: for other that body which they saw, was the body of that flesshe, whiche (as Saynt Austen sayeth) was geuen vs to eate, and that flesshe was the flesshe of that body whiche they saw, and should not eate it, or els that body was of an other flesshe and that flesshe of an other body, and then the one or the other, not Christes body or Christes flesshe, which were (I suppose) euen curstednes to thinke. For wher of is his owne body, but of his owne flesshe: And where of is his owne flesshe, but of his owne body: And therfore where he sayth the same flesshe, he might haue sayd the same body. And where he sayth this body that you see, he might haue said, this flesh ỳ you se, is al one. And therfore when he putteth eating in the one place, and not eatinge

in

in the other, and bothe of one thynge, what can be more contrary?

Cap. 15.

CATHOLICVS. I wonder that thou canst not, make as great shifte, to ridde thy selfe out of errour, as thou doest, to keepe thee in it: for indeede to keepe thee in it, thou hast layd enoughe, and a greate deale to muche. But of the other side, nothing at all. And therefore to helpe thee out of it (yf thou be so happie) heare now, what I haue to say. HERE. What? CATH. To whome shall we take these wordes to be spoken, that Saynt Austen sayeth in the parson of christ, you shall not eate this bodie, that you see? HERE. I take them to be spoken to vs, whiche do eate the Sacrament. CATH. That can not be. For that body, whiche he speaketh of, after that sorte, as they did see it, we neuer saw. HERE. Then it is spoken as it were to thapostles, and suche other as did see it. CATH. That is trew. And therfore how did they see it? HERE. How should they see it, but with their eyes? CATH. And what maner of body was it, that they did see with their eyes? HERE. A body sensible, passible, and mortall. CATH. Thou canst make no better, nor more direct answere, then that is. For the wordes of Saynt Austen, are of none other, but of that bodye, which they saw, and that was sensible, for els, they coulde not haue seene it. And therfore where Saynt Austen sayth.

» Ye shall not eate this body that you see,

He might as well haue sayd, ye shal not eate this body that ye feele or may feele. Whereof it is written, Pal-

pate

pate & videte, That is to say.
Feele and see. Luc.24

Or ye shall not eate this body that is passible, whereof it is written.

Oportet eum multa pati, That is to say. It behoueth him to suffer many thynges. Mar. 8,

Or, ye shall not eate this body that is mortall (whereof it is written.)

Oportet eum occidi. That is to say, it behoueth hym to be slayne. Luc.9,

And what were any of these sayinges against this, that in the other place he sayth. Christ hath geuen vs the same flesshe to eate, wherein he walked here in earth?

HERE. Mary syr, if that be trew, then he hath geuen vs, visible, palpable, passible, and mortall flesshe to eate. For therein he walked here in yearth, and that he neuer gaue vs, to anie suche purpose. Wherfore this latter sayinge of Saynt Austen can not be trew. CATH. No can? HERE. No trewly. CATH. Then how sayest thou to this? doth not Christe now in heauen, sit on the right hande of God the Father, in the same flesshe, wherein he walked here in earthe. HERE. That can not I tell. CATH. Why canst not thou tell? for yf he sit not there in the same flesshe, wherein he walked here in earth, then he sitteth not there in the same flesshe, that he tooke of the holy virgin mary.

If he sit not there in the same flesshe, that he tooke of the virgin Mary, then he sitteth not there, but in an other flesshe, or els in none at all. If he sitteth not there, but in an other flesshe, or in none at all. Then is it not trew to say, that he is her sonne, nor she is his mo-

ther. For she can not be the very mother of an other flesshe, then she brought forth her selfe, or the mother of no flesshe at all. Wherfore, other thou must graunte this to be trew, (as I thinke thou wilt not) that she is not now his mother, nor he her sonne, or els thou musse needes graunte, that on the right hande of God the father in heauen, he sitteth now in the same flesshe wherin he walked here in earthe. For that is the flesshe whiche he tooke of her. HERE. Well syr, I will not sticke to graunt that now, because I see more in it then I did before. CATH. Then if he (now sittinge on the right hande of God the Father in heauen) haue the same flesshe, wherein he walked here in earthe, and the same flesshe, was here in earthe passible and mortall, how canneste thou auoyde this, but that it is passible and mortall now in heauen? HERE. No syr not so. For I can auoyde that well enoughe, and it were but by this, that ye declared yesterday, how John Frithe was deceiued in his foundation, by mistakinge of this same worde, the same. For althoughe Christe haue now the same body and flesshe in heauen, wherin he walked here in earthe, yet he hath not there now the same, in the same and euerie condition. CATH. Then it is the same, and not the same. HERE. What els? For it is the same bodie and the same flesshe in respecte of the substance, but not the same in respecte of the state, condition, and accidentall qualites thereof, whiche it had when he walked here in earthe. For it was then passible and mortall, but now impassible, and immortall, whiche are cleane contrarye. And therefore not the same now, that it was then, nor the same then, that it is now

in

one reſpecte. And yet the very ſame then, that it is now, and the very ſame now that it was then, in an other reſpecte. For ſuche is the difference betwene the ſubſtance and the ſtate, condition and accidentall qualites of any thinge, that it may alway and trewly be ſayde, to be the ſame and not the ſame in thoſe dyuerſe reſpectes.

Cap. 16.

CATHOLICVS. Thou makeſt me greatly marueil to here the ſpeake. HERE. Why ſo? CATH. Becauſe thou haſte (as thy wordes doeth declare) ſo good vnderſtanding of the difference, that is betwene the ſubſtance of a thinge, and the ſtate, condition, or accidentall qualites of the ſame. And yet neuertheleſſe, wilt take Saynt Auſten ſo ouerthwartly as thou doeſt. For where he ſayeth.

Chriſt hath giuen vs, the ſame fleſhe to eate, wherein he walked here in earthe.

Thou takeſt hym to meane that fleſhe in euery condition, wyth all ſuche accidentall qualites as it had then. And not in the only reſpecte of the ſubſtance of it. And agayne, where he ſayeth,

Ye ſhall not eate this body that ye ſee,

Thou takeſt him to ſpeake that, in reſpecte of the ſubſtance, and not in the onelie reſpecte of the ſtate, condition, and qualites of it. So that, thou vnderſtandeſt Saint Auſten wronge in bothe places. That is to ſaye, thou takeſt his meanynge of the fyrſte place, to be in the ſeconde, and of the ſeconde, to be in the firſt, as the places them ſelues, are well able to declare. For where he ſayth.

, Chriſt hath giuen vs, the ſame fleſhe to eate, wherein he
, walked here in earthe.

Cleare it is, that in this ſame woꝛde (vs) Saint Auſten amonge other, ment hym ſelfe to be one. And in that he ment him ſelfe to be one amonge other, to whome he ſayeth, Chriſte hath geuen his fleſhe to eate, playne it is he neuer mente, that Chriſte gaue it him oꝛ them to eate, but as it was in his tyme, when he ſhould eate it. And in his time when he ſhoulde and did eate it, it was nother paſſible, noꝛ moꝛtall, noꝛ yet ſubiecte to any ſuch other accidentall and naturall qualites, as it was beꝛoꝛe the reſurrection therof. Wherfoꝛe thou mayeſt by thys, with halfe an eye perceue, that Saynt Auſten, neuer ſpake thoſe woꝛdes of Chriſtes geuing his owne fleſhe to eate, in reſpecte of anie ſuche qualites, but onlie in reſpecte of the veritee of the ſubſtance. HERE. Then, why doeth he adde vnto them, theſe woꝛdes, ſayinge.

, Wherein he walked here in earth.

CATH. That he doeth, to declare his mynde and meaninge in the veritee of the thinge, whiche was in Saynt Auſtens time, (euen as it is now) the very ſame wherein he walked here in earth, and is now in the holy Sacrament. The verie ſame I ſay, in the only reſperte of the ſubſtance, but (as euerie man doeth oꝛ ought to know) not the ſame, in reſpect of thoſe qualites, which in his reſurrection were chaunged into ſuch perfections as are to vs inſcrutable and incompꝛehenſible. And therfoꝛe of the other ſide, where Saynt Auſten ſayeth,

, Ye ſhall not eate this body that ye ſee,

Why wilt not thou ſee, that to be ſpoken, not in reſpect of the ſubſtance but of the qualites, when the facultee of

ſeinge

seyng or sight, doothe no farther extende or pertayne but vnto the vnderstanding of the qualitees, and not of the substaunce: For if he had sayd.

Ye shall not eate this body, and gone no farther.

Or had added vnto it these woordes.

Which shalbe geuen for you.

As it was sayde at his institucion of the holy sacrament, it had bene then an other matter. But when he saieth.

Ye shall not eate this body that ye see.

What is it els to say, but that ye shall not eate this body visible, or this body sensible, or this body in such condicion and state, as ye now see it in. when the seeyng it selfe, dooth impoort no farther of the body, but as apertayneth vnto the sight, or sensibilitee thereof?

HERE. Then, why doth he adde vnto it these woordes, saiyng.

I haue set foorth vnto you, a certayne sacrament. If it be spiritually vnderstande, it geueth you lyfe. But the flesshe profiteth nothyng.

CATH. First, these woordes.

But the flesshe profiteth nothyng.

Are in this place, of Frithes owne adding and putting vnto the other before. And not of Saynt Austens puttyng there. Yow be it because they be the woordes of the gospell, and of Saint Austen recited, not far from the same place, where Frith doth take the rest, I wyll not cleane omit them, but I will spare them for a whyle, And first go to this that he saith.

I haue set foorth vnto you a certayne sacrament, and beyng spiritually vnderstand, it geueth you lyfe.

Therefore what other thinge is that to say but this, that

when he saith,

, Ye shall not eate this body that ye see.

Ye shal not eate it in such sorte, as ye see it, but as it shal be in a sacrament, wherin ye shall not see it. For els, if he had not so ment, he woulde not haue sayde.

, Except ye eate the flesshe of the sonne of man, and drynke , his blood ye shall not haue life in you.

For he ment not that flesshe to be eaten in that proper visible fourme whiche they saw, and yet to be eaten, in deede for all that, or els he woulde not haue denied lyke (as he dothe) for the not eating of it. And therfore eaten it must needes be of very necessitee. Although not that, as it was of them seene, but yet that, as it shuld be of them and vs both, trewly and verily beleued, in the holy sacrament. And for that cause he saieth, I haue sette forth vnto you a certayne sacrament, and beyng spiritually vnderstande (that is to say, farther and farre otherwyse then your sences can reache) it geueth you lyfe. Wherefore because here appeereth both eatyng and not eatyng of one thynge both at once, whiche are bothe trew, And that can not be in one respect, it must therfore nedes folow to be vnderstand and taken, as the trewth is, in two respectes. Wherof the one, that is to say, the eatyng, is in respect of the verye thinge, with the inuisible state, occult and secrete behauiour thereof, as it is in the holy sacrament. And the other, that is to say the not eatyng, is not but in respect of the visible fourme, and sencible apparence thereof to their eyes. And therfore this eating and not eatinge be not here so direct contraries, as thou takest them for.

Lay

Cap. 17.

HERE. Then, where is this become that he saith,

If it be spiritually vnderstand, it geueth you lyke?
As who say, or els it doth not? CATH. I haue tolde the that already. HERE. Ye but yet euen therin consisteth Frithes purpose altogether, as it maie partly apeere by that he saith in the. 21. leafe of his booke, where he reciteyng the sayinge of Christe to the Iewes that beleued him not, And also the minde of Saint Austen therupon (as he saith) he hath these woordes.

Christe said, doth this offend you? what will ye say then, when ye shall see the sonne of man ascendynge thither, where he was before? Then addeth S. Austen (saithe he) you shall know that he ment not, to geue his flesh to eate with your teeth: for he shall ascende hole. And Christe addeth, it is the spirite that quickneth, The flesshe profyteth nothynge. The woordes that I spake, are spirite and lyfe. That is to say, (saith Sainte Austen) are spiritually to bee vnderstande. And where Christe saith, that the flesh profyteth nothyng, meanynge of his owne flesh, (as saynt Austen saith), he meaneth that it profiteth not, as they vnderstode him. That is to say, it profiteth not, if it were eaten.

Now here ye may see, how Frith hath plainely proued both by the woordes of Christe, and also by Saynt Austen vpon the same, that all this matter lyeth in a spirituall sense, and must bee vnderstande spiritually.

CATHOLI. Frith hath not proued that so plainely, as he hath herein, proued him selfe a false lyar once againe. For vnder the colour of his allegation of Christe, and Saynt Austen together, he hath herein wrapped no small pece of his owne heretical falshed, to

defate

deface the trewth of them both. For of those woords of Christe, the flesshe profiteth nothynge, when Saint Austen saith it profiteth not, as they vnderstode him, where did this antichrist fynde this exposicion, which he addeth vnto it, saiyng.

» It profiteth not, if it weare eaten.

S. Austen hath no suche thynge nor Christe nother. And yet as though they had, this crafty and false Maynarde doth annex it vnto their saiynges, to make it seme to be their meanynges. HERE. And will you call him an antechrist therefore? CATH. What should I call him els? For who can be more contrary to Christ herein, then he is? for Christ saith.

» Except ye eate it, ye shall not haue life in you.

And he sayth.

» If ye eate it, it shall not profite you.

HERE. Tushe, those be not Frithes woordes. For he saith.

» It profiteth not if it were eaten.

CATH. And what is that, but if ye eate it, it shall not profite you? is it not all one? Therefore is there any thynge more agaynst Christes saiynge then that? when Christe saieth,

» Except ye eate it, ye shall not haue life in you.

Doth lyke not profyte? and specially euerlastynge lyfe, whiche Christe doth meane, and promise that we shall not haue it, except we eate his flesshe? And yet this antechrist saith, it shall not profyte vs, if we eate it. Therefore, whiche of these two, are we best to beleue? Christe, or this his wicked aduersary? for both we can not allow, they be so contrary. HERE. They be not so contrary as ye take them. For all Christes meaninge

(as

(as it apereth by his owne woordes) is of spirituall eatyng by feyth, and not of carnall eating with the teth.

And that doth Frith defend and nothynge els, as it apereth in the .44. lefe of his boke where his woordes be these.

If Christe had (sayth he) so ment, that his owne bodie naturall should haue continued in the sacrament, whiche is the meate of the soule thorow feyth, and not of the body, by eatynge of it, and maie as well be eaten thorow feyth, although it remayne in heauen, as if it were here present to our mouthes, if he had (I saie) so ment, then wold he neuer haue geuen vs suche scriptures as he did. For I say that this grosse imagination may not stande with the processe of the scripture, whiche is receiued, as it shall appere by certeine textes. First where our sauiour saith, The flesshe profiteth nothyng. The waight of those woordes doth compell vs to vnderstande our matter spiritually. For by this shorte sentence, we are no lesse plucked backe from the carnall eatyng, then was Nichodemus, that he should not once dreame of the carnall regeneracion, when Christe saide vnto him. That what so euer was of the flesshe, was flesshe.

And also againe, in the .47. leafe, Frith hath accordyng to the same euen these woordes.

It is impossible (saith he) the scriptures standyng as they dooe) that the naturall body of Christe, shoulde be present to our teeth in the sacramente. And as for our faith, it neadeth not to haue hym present in the bread. For I maie as well eate him and drynke him thorow faith. That is to say, beleue in him, as though he were as present in the sacrament, as he was hangynge on the Crosse.

In this ye see, Fryth dothe expresse his mynde so playnly that no man can doubt of his meanynge therein. Whiche in effect resteth but in two pointes, whereof the one is. That christes very bodie flesshe and blood hath no verie beeynge nor reall presence in the

ſacrament. And the other is, that what ſo euer Chriſte ſpake as towchynge the eatynge therof, muſt nedes be vnderſtande, onely ſpirituall. And theſe two hath he proued by the woordes of Chriſte, and alſo by S. Auſten to. CATH. What, wilt thou be at that poynt yet, for all that thou haſt hytherto herde already? thou plaieſt the very Frithiã now in dede, to ſay that he hath proued both, when he hath proued in dede none of thẽ both by any thynge that we haue harde of him yet. But thou haſt herde proue enough to the contrary, if that wolde ſerue. And therfore what ſo euer he hath brought for his proue hytherto, hath other made directly agaynſt him, or els vtterly nothynge for him. Therefore ſpeake of no proue that he maketh, for he maketh none in dede. HERE. Yes ſyr, for he hath proued, that it muſt be vnderſtande ſpiritually. And therof it muſt nedes folowe, that it maie not be vnderſtande carnally, for they be two contraries. And therefore, where there maie be no carnall vnderſtandynge, there can be no fleſſhe remaynynge. Wherefore thus hath Fryth his purpoſe thorowly, that is to ſay, that the fleſhe profiteth not to be eaten, and that, by reaſon of the ſpirituall vnderſtandinge, wherof he is moſt aſſured, both by chriſts woordes (as I ſayde) and Saynt Auſtens alſo. CATHOLI. Then if he were ſo aſſured, he coulde not be therein deceiued. HERE. No more he was. CATH. Troweſt thou ſo? HERE. I thinke ſo. HE. Why, thou maiſt perceiue by thine owne reaſon, and alſo by this which I told the before, that although, it muſt be vnderſtand ſpiritually yet it foloweth not that it muſt be vnderſtãd only ſpiritually. For ſpiritually (as I ſaid) and onely ſpiritually

tually, is two thinges. Therfore if Frith take it to be vnderstande onely spiritually without any other, or farther respect, then he taketh it otherwyse, then he hath, or is able to proue it, by the woordes of Christe, or Saint Austens other. Againe of the other syde, if he take it to be vnderstande spiritually and not onely so, Then hath he proued therin, so muche for his purpose, as is in deede, euen nothyng at all. HERE. Why syr it is prose enoughe for him, that he is by Saint Austen moste certayne and sure (as he hath declared) that it must be vnderstande spiritually. CATH. What although it be so, and not onely so? HERE. Ye why not?

Cap. 18.

CATHOLI. Then if thou rest vpon that, what if Frith knew not, what the spirituall vnderstandynge of it is? HERE. Yes that I dare saie he did. CATH. Then he woldo haue geuen it a diffinicion, and made it certaine, before he had wrought anie conclusion therupon, as euery trew and wyse persuader dothe, in what so euer he taketh vpon him to proue. But this we see he did not. And why? but other because he was therin ignorannt, and therfore coulde not do it, or els because he was of such a malicious falshed, that though he could, ye he woloe not doe it Which is of the twayn, most lyke to be trew. For he saw perchance that if he had made a good diffinicion, or playne distinction, betweene the spirituall and the carnall vnderstandyng therof, it should not only not haue serued, but also clene haue destroied his purpose altogether. And therfore he chose rather to roue at a venture, the to shote at any mark certein. wherfore let vs, seke out the certeinte of this spi-

rituall vnderſtandyng. And that once had, wee ſhall ſoone ſee, whether he went about to bring it to light, or els to hyde it all together, or no. For he will not deny but that Saynt Auſten and other olde auncient, fathers and doctors of the holy church, did certeinly know it, when he pretendeth to proue all his purpoſe, moſte chiefely by them. HERE. I graunt that, for them he will not deny. CATH. Then remember thou well, what I haue hytherto ſayd. And let vs returne to the examination of that, which thou haſt recited all ready, out of the 21. leafe of his booke. HERE. Marry ſir that is how Chriſte, to thoſe that beleued him not, did ſay.

, Doth this offende you? what if ye ſhall ſee the ſonne of
, man aſcendynge thyther, where he was before? Then
, addeth S. Auſten (ſaith he) you ſhal know, that he ment
, not, to geue his fleſhe to eate with your teeth. For he
, ſhall aſcende hole. &c.

CATHOLICVS. Is this Saint Auſtens ſaynge vpon thoſe woordes of Chriſt? HERE. So ſaith Frith. CATH. Therefore here, thou ſhalt ſee once agayne, what Frith was. For if it were not for auoyding of tediouſnelle, I woulde recite vnto the, the very woordes of S. Auſten, vpon thoſe woords of Chriſte, both in latine and alſo in engliſh. but his woords in latine turned into engliſhe ſhall be ſufficient, which are euen very theſe.

, Chriſte anſwerynge ſayd, Dothe this offende you, that
, I ſayde, I geue you my fleſſhe to eate, and my bloodde
, to drynke? This offendeth you in deede. Therefore what
, if ye ſee the ſonne of man aſcendynge thyther where he
, was before? What is this? By this he eaſed ſome,
, whom he knew. By this he opened wherwith they
, were offended. Wherwith vtterly, if they woulde haue
, vnderſtande it. For they thought him to deuyde and

diſtribute

distribute his body. But he sayde, he wolde ascende into heauen euen whole. When ye shall see the sonne of man ascendinge where he was before, ye shall certaynlie see euen then, that he distributeth not his body, in that maner that you thinke. Ye shall euen then certenly vnderstande, that his grace is not with bytinges consumed.

Now where is this, that Frithe sayeth of Saynt Austen.

You shall know that he ment not, to geue his flesh to eate, with your teethe.

Where is this (I saye) where is it? in deede it can not be founde. And therefore in the steede of that, thys we finde, that Frithe was nothinge ashamed of his lies. For if he had, he wolde neuer haue put so many of them in his writinges as he did. And besides this, what faute is there here founde, with those vnbeleuers of Christe, whiche vnderstode him not in this matter? HERE. This faute, That their vnderstandinge ranne vpon the flesh of Christ. CATH. That is false. For their faute was not therin, but it was in their misvnderstanding of the maner of it, as here Saynt Austen in playne wordes doeth well declare, they thought him to deuyde, and distribute his body peece mele. And that misvnderstandinge, doeth Christes question touche directly, sayinge. What yf ye see the sonne of man, ascendynge where he was before?

What were this question of his hoole body to the purpose, if it were not to confound, and ouerthrow their misvnderstandinge of the diuision therof in partes? for by this, he opened, (as Saynt Austen sayeth) wherewith they were offended. Whiche was with the distribution and erogation of his body in partes as they thought. So that their faute (for whiche they are here reprehen-

ded) was for that they gaue no farther credence to Christ, in the maner of geuyng his flesshe to eate, then theyr owne imagination, and blinde vnderstandinge did leade them vnto. And not for that, they thought hys meanynge to be of hys owne very flesshe in deede. For whyche thinkinge of his owne very flesshe, they bare here, no smake of any blame at all, as they should haue done, if it had bene a faute so to thinke. Wherefore, this thou mayst see, how very nothinge, this place maketh for Frithe, notwithstandinge all the great trust that he had therin.

Cap. 19.

HERE. Ye but syr, ye must consider, that (as you haue herde) Frithe goeth farther then this. Saying euen there.

» Christ addeth. It is the spirite that quickeneth, the flesshe » profiteth nothinge.

This text excludeth all vnderstanding of flesh, and driueth vs to the spirit altogether. CATH. There, Frithe wolde haue it indeede. But why doeth he not bringe in Saynt Austen there, as well vpon this text.

» The flesshe profiteth nothinge.

As he wolde make vs beleue, he doeth, vpon this other before.

» It is the spirit that quickeneth.

Sythe they ioyne so nere together, as immediatly one text after an other can do. HERE. He thought it was no neede, because this. The flesshe profiteth nothinge, is so playne of it selfe. CATH. It is harde to finde thee without an excuse. But neuertheless thou shalt here

what

what Saynt Austen sayeth of it, for all that. And then iudge, why Frith did passe it ouer. For Saynt Austens wordes turned into englishe are euen these.

What is this (sayth Saynt Austen) that he putteth to it, it is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing? let vs say vnto hym (because he suffreth vs, not speakinge contrary, but coueting to know) O good lorde and mayster, how doth flesshe profit nothing, when thou hast sayd, except a man eate my flesshe, and drinke my bloud, he shall not haue lyfe in hym? doth lyfe profit nothing? And for what purpose are we that we are, but that we might haue euerlasting life, whiche thou hast prompsed with thy flesh. Therfore what is, it profiteth nothing, the flesshe profiteth nothinge, but as they vnderstode it? for they vnderstode flesshe so, as it is rent, or torne in a dead carkas, or as it is soulde in the shambles, and not as it is quickened with the spirits. Therfore so it is sayde, the flesshe profiteth nothinge, as it is sayde science puffeth vp. Now therfore ought we to hate science? God forbyd. And what is, science puffeth vp: alone without charitee. Therfore he ioyneth to it. But yet charitee doeth edifie. Adde therefore charitee to science, and science is profitable, not by it selfe, but by charytee. Also now lykewyse, the flesshe profiteth nothinge, beinge flesshe alone. Let the spirite come to the flesshe, as charitee commeth to science and it profiteth very muche.

And a littell after, he speakynge in the parson of Christe knitteth vp hys exposicion of thys texte wyth these wordes.

So, I geue not my flesshe to eate, as they did vnderstand, flesshe.

Wherof it folowth (say I) that otherwise he did geue it to eate, although he did it not so. For the wordes import no lesse. Therfore, here thou mayste parceyue, why Frith brought not forth this place or exposition of Saint

Austen

Auſten, as he doeth the texte, wherevpon he goeth. Whiche was in deede, becauſe he lyked not Saynt Auſten ſo well in other places, but he liked hym as euyll in this, for all his falſe boſtinge, that he maketh ſo muche for his purpoſe. Where as in deede, he maketh for him in no place, but directlie agaynſt hym in many places, as it hath, and hereafter ſhall right well appere. Where fore in all this, thou ſeeſt, Saynt Auſten taketh not the ſpirituall ſence ſo, that he excludeth the whole vnderſtandynge of all fleſhe therein. HERE. Syr, Saynt Auſten commeth not to that yet. For vnto this text, that is to ſay,

> It is the ſpirite that quickeneth, the fleſhe profiteth nothinge.

Frithe doeth adde the wordes of Chriſt folowing, with Saynt Auſtens mynde vpon the ſame, whiche wordes are theſe.

> The wordes that I ſpake vnto you, are ſpirite and life,
> That is to ſay (ſayeth Saynt Auſten) are ſpiritually to be vnderſtande.

Here is the hoole matter come now, euen clerely to light, bothe by Chriſte and Saynt Auſten to. And what wolde you haue more? CATH. This expoſition of S. Auſtens, whiche thou ſpeakeſt of now, is very ſhorte. And more ſhorte then he is wonte to make vpon ſo great a matter. And therefore coulde Frith finde no more of it but this? HERE. Yes ſyr ſumwhat more, which will lyke you leſſe, if ye heare it. CATH. It were ſtrainge that I ſhould miſlike any of Saynt Auſtens doinges in ſuche matters. And therefore what ſo euer it be, I pray thee let me heare it. HERE. That ſhall ye do. For Frithe in the. 45 leafe of his booke hath theſe wordes.

Thys

This is a playne conclusion (sayeth he) that when Christe sayde, the flesshe profiteth nothinge, he ment it euen of his owne flesshe, that it coulde not profit, as they vnderstode hym, to be eaten with the teethe. Albe it, it dothe muche profit to be slayne for our redemption, and eaten thorough fayth. Whiche thinge we may do, although his naturall flesshe be not in the Sacrament. For I may as wel beleue in hym, thoughe he be in heauen, as if he were in earthe, and in the Sacrament, and before myne eyes. And that Christe spake these wordes of his owne body, it is playne, by Saynt Austens wordes, writing vpon the same place. And therefore he sayeth, that they must be vnderstande spyrytually, and addeth, if thou vnderstande them spyritually they are spirite and life. And thoughe thou vnderstand them carnally, yet neuertheless they are spirit & life. But vnto thee, they are not spirit & life, which vnderstandest not spiritually, those thinges that I haue spoken.

Here you may see now, that Frithe hath more of Saint Austens exposition, then I tolde you of before.

CATH. Ys but vpon what wordes of Christ, doeth Saynt Austen make this exposition, which Frithe doeth here alledge? HERE. Vpon these, that Christe sayeth, my wordes are spirit and life. CATH. Thou sayest euen very trew. And therfore where thou tellest me, that I may here see now, that Frithe hathe more of Saynt Austens exposition, then thou diddest tell me of before, I say vnto thee agayne, that thou mayest here see (yf thou marke it well) that vpon these wordes of christe, The flesshe profiteth nothinge.

Frith dothe bring in that exposition of S. Austens, which Saint Austen maketh vpon this sayinge of Christe. The wordes which I haue spoken vnto you, ar spirit & life.

And the proper exposition that Saynt Austen maketh vpon these wordes. THE flesshe profiteth nothynge.

which exposition, I recited vnto thee right now my self, he doth cleane omit and dissemble, as though there were no suche matter at all. Therfore wilt thou not see, what a parte he playeth herein? Thus to applie a mans exposition of one text, to an other, and his proper exposition of that other, cleane omit, dissemble, and will not be knowne of it: Hast thou seen a more manifest falshed at any mans hande?

Cap. 20.

HERE. Syr the matter is not so great as ye make it. For when Christ saith, my wordes are spirit and life, he meaneth those wordes whiche he spake at that tyme, amonge whiche were euen these,

The flesshe profyteth nothynge.

Therefore they be of the wordes, which he meaneth to be spirit and life. That is to say, spiritually (as S. Austen sayth) to be vnderstand. Wherfore these wordes of saynt Austen, spiritually to be vnderstande, do as well serue and expounde this texte.

The flesshe profiteth nothynge.

As they do this text.

My wordes are spirit and life.

Wherupon they were (as you say) directly and purposely spoken. CATH. Ye but why doth not Frithe, as Saynt Austen doth, put eache of those textes, with their owne proper and whole expositions by them selfes? And then with conference made betwene them, see what he coulde gather of them bothe together, for his purpose? HERE. I can tell what your answere wolde be, yf you were asked that question: CATH. What? HERE. Ye wolde

wolde say, that he wolde not so do, because, that the one exposition, wolde haue made as muche agaynst hym, as the other semeth to make with him. CATH. What moueth thee to thinke, that I wolde so say, but euen the verie treuth therof? for most trew it is, that the one exposition soundeth no more of the spirit, then the other doeth of the flesshe. Whiche Frithe coulde in no wise away with all. And therfore that made hym so redy to bringe forth that one, which might seme to make for his purpose, and not to be knowne of the other, whiche maketh so muche agaynst him. For all his purpose was in nothinge so muche, as to exclude all the reall beyng of Christes very flesshe, in the holy Sacrament. For there, he wolde haue nothing but very bread in a bare signification. And therfore coulde he abide nothing, that myght seme or sounde to the contrary. But what so euer he coulde finde amonge the olde holy fathers, to sounde or smacke of any spirituall vnderstandinge in the matter, that did he catche and holde, thinkinge vtterly thereby, to proue his intente thorowly. Neuer serchinge what they mente by it, but alway tooke it and applied it to that he wente aboute, whiche was, as it dothe well appere, nothinge els but falshed indeede. And therefore it proued there after. For had he bene at the fyrste, as redy to trie what the olde holy fathers ment, by that spirituall vnderstandynge, as he was rashe and readie to runne headlinge vpon hys owne dreamynge thereof, without any good aduysement or dew consyderation, or wolde haue referred the iudgement of his owne phansyes, to the Holy Catholike churche, as euery trew and good christen mā ought to do, and as I

For my part, dayly pray God of his grace, that I neuer do otherwise, if he had (I say) this done, it had neuer proued with him & some other as it hath done, whiche was but according, to this old saying, the hasty man, lacketh neuer woo. HERE. Sir why do you account him rash and hasty herin, when he taketh not the olde holy doctours, but according to their owne sayinges? CATH. I do account him so, because all sayinges, are not alway so simple, but that many of them oftentimes, contayne and haue in eache of them, diuerse vnderstandinges. Or els there should not be as there is, suchs contention aboute there meaninges, after that men hath vttered and putte forthe their bare sayinges. Wherfore, the faut of rashnes that I finde with Frithe, is because he looked so muche vpon their sayinges, that he palled nothing vpon their verie meaninges, but to their sayinges, he ioyned his owne meaninges, and thereby deceiued him self and many other moo. HERE. Why, what other meaninge should he gather of this their saying, a spiritual vnderstanding, but a spiritual vnderstanding in deede? And that he not only doeth, but also defendeth, as much as he can. And therfore as I tolde you before, where there is a spiritual vnderstandinge, there can be no carnall vnderstandinge. And where there can be no carnall vnderstanding, there can be no very flesh remayning. CATH. Thou sayst so. But how wil he, or thou other, proue ý there is in this matter no carnal vnderstanding, or no flesh remayning? HERE Because there is a spiritual vnderstanding. CAT That followeth not. For I tolde thee diuerse times before, that spirituall, and only spirituall are two thinges, for if it be not only spiritual, then it may be both so, and otherwise

that

that is to say, so in one respect, and otherwyse in another respect. Wherefore if it male be, both so and otherwyse, where is Frithes purpose become then, which resteth all together vpon only so and none otherwyse? Therfore he must proue, that it is onely mere spirituall, and not only that, but also, what a spirituall vnderstandynge is. For without that all his hole talke, is but vayne babblynge and nothyng els.

Cap. 21.

HERE. Well syr, it is to late for him, to doo that nowe. And therefore sith ye holde it so necessary to be done, I pray you for the fruictful furderance of our talke herein, declare you whether the vnderstandyng of it be onely mere spirituall or not, and what the spirituall vnderstandyng of it is. CATH. Then thou must first consider this, that although some, yet all and euery spirituall vnderstandynge, doth not exclude, and forbyd the vnderstandynge of all maner of flesshe, as it doth, when it is but onely and mere spirituall, as some tyme it is, and some tyme not. For if thou take spirituall vnderstandynge so, that is to saie, to be alway of onely and mere spirituall thinges, thou shalt not take anie body or flesshe, within the compas of any spirituall vnderstandynge at all. Wherefore if thou take it so, that there may be no spirituall vnderstandyng of any flesshe, thou takest it then, euen directly against the holy Apostle Saint Paule, wrytynge to the Corinthians of the generall resurrection, and describinge the difference of the state of the body before and after, where he saythe, It is sowne a naturall body, and it shall ryse a spirituall 1. cor. 15

» body. There is a naturall body. And there is a spiritu-
» all body.

And a little after he saith also.

» That is not first, whiche is spirituall, but that, whiche is
» naturall. And then that whiche is spirituall.

Here thou maiest see by the holy apostle (if thou trust him) that some bodye is, and mo shalbe, spirituall at length. And a spirituall body can not be, trewly vnderstande, but at the least in some respect spyrytually. Except thou wilt say, it maie be otherwyse vnderstande then it is, which is no perfyte good, and trew, vnderstandyng in dede. Therefore, this doth not follow, as Frith wolde haue it, that where is a spirituall vnderstandynge, there is no flesshe. But this doothe well folowe, that where there is spirituall flesshe, there the vnderstandynge must needes be spirituall, not therin denyng the veritee of the flesshe, but declaring the state and condicion therof. Yet this spirituall vnderstanding, is not al onely and mere spirituall, because it is not dyrectly and only of a spirite, but of a certaine perfite and very flesshe, whiche is spirituall, and not a spirite, but spirituall, for that it is aduaunced so nere the perfection of the spirite, wherunto it is knit, and therby made spirituall, as of the contrarie parte, the minde of some man is made carnall and fleshly, not because it is flesshe but because it is so addict vnto the flesshe, that it is become subiect vnto the vitious desires or inclinatiō therof. And therfore called (as it is in dede) flesshely. For of such a man, we saie, he is a man of a fleshly mynde, yet his minde is not flesshe for all that. Wherfore as the spirite of that man is fleshly and no flesshe, so is the flesshe of

the other, ſpirituall and no ſpirite. And ſo that it is ſpirituall, it muſt be ſpiritually vnderſtande. And that can it not trewly be without the ſpirite, by whiche it is made ſpirituall. And therfore the woordes whiche are ſpoken of that fleſhe, are called ſpyrite and lyfe, that is to ſay, ſpiritually to be vnderſtande. For without that ſpyrite the fleſhe profyteth nothyng. Wherwith, they were trewly anſwered, whiche take it otherwyſe, that is to ſay, without the ſpyrite. As it apereth by the woords of Saint Auſten recited before.

Cap. 22.

HERE. Yet it wyll not ſynke in to my head, but that, if this ſpirituall vnderſtandyng of fleſhe, be of fleſhe, that is verye fleſhe in deede, it muſt nedes haue alſo then, a fleſhly vnderſtanding with all. Becauſe it ſemeth more agreable to the thinge, then the ſpirituall vnderſtandynge of it dothe. For what maketh vnderſtandinge carnall or fleſhelie but fleſhe? or howe can fleſhe bee not fleſhely vnderſtande, when vnderſtanding muſt needes be after, and accordinge to the thing that is vnderſtande? CA. Herein thou art as frith was, wonderfully deceiued. For he did, as thou doſt put no difference, Inter carnem & carnalem. That is to ſay, betwene fleſhe, and fleſhly or fleſhy, when the one hath reſpecte to the ſubſtaunce of fleſhe, and the other, to the naturall qualitees, diſpoſicions, propertees and vſage thereof, or thereunto belonginge. And therefore when the fleſhe is vnderſtande, after anye of them, then the vnderſtandynge of it, is carnall and fleſhely. For thoſe

naturall

naturall qualitees, propertees, and disposicions of flesshe, is it, that maketh the vnderstandinge of it carnall and fleshelye, and not the substaunce it selfe: as it maie well appere, not onely By Saint Paule, but also by Saint Austen vpon the same firt chapiter of Saint John, where his woordes be these.

, Qui aderant plures, non intelligendo scandalizati
, sunt. Non enim cogitabant hæc audiendo nisi car-
, nem quod ipsi erant. Apostolus autem dicit. Et va-
, rum dicit, sapere secundum carnem, Mors est. Car-
, nem dat nobis suam dominus manducare, & sapere
, secundum carnem, mors est, cum de carne sua dicat,
, quia ibi est vita æterna. Ergo nec carnem debemus
, sapere secundum carnem.

whiche maie thus be englished.

, Many of them that were present, not vnderstandyng the
, matter were offended. For in hearynge these thinges,
, they did not imagine, but the flesshe that they were them
, selues. But the apostle saith, and saith trew, to vnder-
, stande after the flesshe, is death. Our lorde gaue vnto vs,
, his flesshe to eate, and to vnderstande after the flesshe is
, death, when he saide of his owne flesshe, that there is
, euerlastynge lyfe. Therefore we ought not to vnder-
, stande flesshe after the flesshe.

Here thou mayest see a manifest difference of vnderstandynge, betwene flesshe and after the flesshe, and therfore how saist thou to it now? HERE. I say that S. Austen saith here very well. For what meaneth he by this, that we ought not to vnderstande the flesshe after the flesshe, but that we ought to vnderstande it after some other thing, whiche is here ment by the flesshe, and not the flesshe it selfe? CATH. I woulde not

haue

haue thought the so foolishe, as to take it so. for this as is though it were all one to saie, we ought not to vnderstande the flesshe after the flesshe, and to saie, we ought not therein to vnderstande any flesshe at all, when the saiyng forbyddeth vs not, the vnderstanding of the flesshe it selfe, but the vnderstandynge of it, after the common course, and naturall disposicion thereof. It forbyddeth vs to vnderstande it, as nature here daiely doth vse it, and at length shall lese it, but not as the spirite shall at length againe obteine it. The spirite of man it selfe, is nowe in this lyfe muche after the flesshe here, but the flesshe in the nexte lyfe, shalbe after the spirite there. After the flesshe here, hath no place, nor being there. And that ought we to consider here. For the flesshe is one thinge, and after the flesshe is an other. Wherfore although in the course of nature, they go here both together, yet in this matter, our vnderstandinge must plucke them a sonder, or els, thou shalte vnderstande flesshe, after the flesshe, whiche is death, as thou hast harde before, and more playnely doth appere, by the manifest woordes of thapostle againe, in an other place, where he saith.

Et si cognouimus secundum carnem Christum, sed nunc iam non nouimus. That is to say Although we haue knowne Christe after the flesshe, yet we doo not so now. 2.cor.5

What do we then? know we now, no flesshe in Christ? God forbyd. for we know it in dede: but not after the flesshe. What is after the flesshe? Necessitee, passibilitee, corruptibilitee, mortalitee, and such other. These were once knowen in Christe. And his flesshe then, knowen

after them. But so it nother is, nor ought to be knowen now. And therfore not after the flesshe, and yet flesshe in dede for all that, although not flesshly flesshe, which onely maketh flesshely vnderstandyng, But spiritual flesshe which maketh the vnderstandynge spirituall. For as thapostle saith.

1.cor.15 There is a naturall body, and there is a spirituall bodie. And what is that to saie, but there is a naturall flesshe, and there is a spirituall flesshe?

» That (he saith) is not first, which is spirituall. But that » whiche is naturall. And then that whiche is spy- » rituall.

These two states of flesshe, thou maiest know by reason, can not haue lyke vnderstandynge. Wherefore by this, it maie well appere, that the spirituall vnderstandinge of this matter, wherupon Frith doth ground himselfe, and yet vnderstode it not, is not euen onely and mere spirituall, as he doth take it, excludynge all maner of flesshe. But spirituall of spirituall flesshe, whiche Frithes vnderstandynge did neuer touche, nor once dreame vpon. HERE. That is your pleasure so to say.

CATH. No, it shall not be onely my saiynge, but as in the .17. leafe of his booke, it maie be partly perceiued by his owne saiyng, which is this.

» As touchinge the other woordes (saith he) that Christe » spake vnto his disciples at the last supper, I deny not but » that he sayde so, but that he so flesshlie ment, as ye falsly » feygne, I vtterly deny.

Now marke, what doth he meane, by this, whiche he saieth here so fore to our charges, that we haue (as he saith) so falsely feygned of Christes meanynge? HE. He meaneth your feygnynge to be this, that Christ ment,

ment, that his wordes, concernynge his bodie, spoken at his last supper, shoulde be taken and vnderstande fleshlie, whiche can not be. CATH. And meaneth he so? HERE. His wordes declare no lesse. CATH. Therfore by this it is cleere, that his meanynge of our seynynge, is euen like his vnderstandynge, which is in deede both false and fleshly to. For do we seyne, that Christe spake those wordes of his blessed body, with a fleshely meaning? Where findeth he, that we seyne that, as here he lusteth so to lie? For we do not only, not feine it, but vtterly deny it, constantly affirmynge, and faithfully teachynge, that therin Christe ment, in deede very flesh, but yet not (as this flesh monger lieth) fleshly flesh, for all that. How be it euen fleshely flesh it is, which Frith dreameth vppon, and none other. And that deceaueth him altogether. For commonly where so euer he maketh mencion of Christes bodie, his flesh, and eatynge therof, he doth not call it but a naturall bodie, naturall flesh, and the eatynge thereof, carnall eatynge, eatyng with the mouth teeth and belly, and suche other talke concernynge the same, as smelleth not, but euen altogether fleshely and nothynge els: as it appereth in the. 44. and. 45. leafe of his booke, and many other places therein beside: when, as I tolde thee before, betwene flesh and fleshely, there is a great difference, whiche Fryth did nothynge consider. And therfore it is no wonder although he came neuer at the spyrituall vnderstandyng of the matter, beyng so fleshelie phantasied, as his owne talke therein doth plainely declare that he was. Wherfore in him are well verified these wordes of thapostle saiyng.

1,cor.2, Animalis homo non percipit ea quæ ſunt Spiritus
, dei, ſtultitia enim eſt illi, & non poteſt intelligere,
, quia ſpiritualiter examinatur. Spiritualis autem iu-
, dicat omnia.

Whiche maie thus be Engliſhed,

, The fleſhly man vndeſtandeth not thoſe thinges, whiche
, are of the ſpirite of god. For they are fooliſhnes to him, be-
, cauſe he can not vnderſtande that they are ſpiritually to
, be examined. But the ſpirituall man iudgeth all. That
is to ſay.

The ſpirituall man iudgeth all, bothe ſpirituall and carnall. But ſo can not the fleſhly man, whoſe reache paſſeth not the common courſe of naturall and fleſhlie fleſhe, wherfore it is no meruayle, though this fleſhly Fryth, bothe falſly feygne, our vnderſtandyng to be but fleſhely, as his vnderſtandynge was, which could no farther then ſuche fleſhe, as he was of him ſelfe. For in all his booke, thou ſhalt not fynde one ſparke of vnderſtandynge that he had, of any ſpirituall fleſhe at all. And therefore, his thinkynge that our vnderſtandinge of fleſhe is none other, then his was, cauſed him in the .23. leafe of his boke, to haue theſe woordes.
, I wonder (ſaith he) that we haue bene led ſo longe in this
, groſſe errour.

HERE. So doeth many mo, as well as he, I maie ſaie to you.

Cap. 23.

CATHOLI. Ye but what groſſe errour is it, whiche he noteth vs here to be led in ſo long? HE. That ye beleue chriſts very natural body and his

naturall

naturall fleshe, to be presentely in the Sacrament. And therein to haue suche carnall eatinge of it, with toeth and belly, as he maketh mention of, in diuerse places of his booke. CATH. What if we wolde graunte him, that it were a very grose errour, (as he calleth it) so to beleue? HERE. Then ye must other confesse your selues in a great faute for so beleuyng, or els deny, and say ye beleue it not. CATH. Let it so be, that we beleue it not. And what of that? HERE. Then is Frithe and you, euen bothe at a poynte, and of one opinion therin. CATH. Nay not so. For we beleue, that therin is verie fleshe for all that. But he beleueth that therin, is vterly none at all. Therefore his opinion and ours are not bothe one. HERE. Then, how can you beleue, that therin is Christes very fleshe, if ye beleue not, that hys naturall bodie, and naturall fleshe is in it? CATH. Well enough. For if thy weake hedde coulde beare it, I wolde deny, that Christ hath any naturall body, or naturall fleshe other. HERE. No not in the sacrament. CATH. No nor in heauen or any where els. HERE. What neuer speake it. For then it must folowe, that he hath no very body, nor very flesh at al. CATH. That is after Frithes learning. For his wit was so yoked with the commen course of nature, that his vnderstandinge coulde reache no farther. And yet in his tyme I dare say he herde of this difference of thinges, that some were naturall, and some supernaturall. Wherfore, I deny not, but that the blessed body and very fleshe of our Sauyour Christe, was once naturall, but not synce the tyme of hys resurrection. For what is naturall, but what so euer is vnder the yoke and lawes of nature, as our bodies

are, and our flesh is? And what thinges may we call supernaturall if that be not one of them, whiche hath bene once naturall, and now hath ouercome the power and strength of nature, and hath gotten cleane out of the lawes and bondage therof? wherefore, yf thou say, that there is no suche thinge, then thou must needs graunte, that the body, and flesh of our Sauiour Christ hath euen now, neede of eyer and brethe, meate, drinke, slepe and suche other, as without whiche, no naturall body of man
Ex.34. doeth, or can be able, to lyue and indure. Except it be by
3.re.19. myracle for a season, as in parte, it was wyth Moyses and Helyas by the space of. 40. dayes. Therefore if the body of Christ haue now, neede of those thinges, then it is passible, and may suffer. If it be passible and may suffer, then it is mortall, and may dye. And that I am suer thou wilt not graunt. Wherfore if it can not dye, it is not mortall, if it be not mortall, it can not suffer. If it cannot suffer, it hath no neede of those thinges, or any other like. If it hathe no neede of any of those thinges, what hathe nature to do with it, when those be thynges, which of necessite nature requereth? Therfore if nature haue nothing to do with it, how can it be natural? That, is not naturall, whiche the course of nature hath nothinge to do with all. Therfore why doth Frithe so often call it natural, but because his vnderstanding of it, was so carnal that he coulde see no sparke of the state of it, whiche is spiritual? He did not know, that natural and carnal, are no meete, nor conuenient termes, to be put to the expression of the holy flesh of Chryste, as they are not indede If a man should go to the very proper signification of the wordes. Because therein they make no difference

betwene

betwene the state of that flesche and ours. For ours is naturall and carnall. And therefore to the declaring of hys flesh, there should be put in the place of naturall, supernatural. And in the place of carnal, spiritual, as now the verites of the thinge, doth most worthyly and dewly require. For if it were alway used to be spoken of so, it wolde perchance ease some weake myndes, of many carnall and fleshly phantasies, that runneth yet in their heddes aboute this matter, as there did none other in Frithes hedde, so longe as he lyued. For as it appereth in dyuerse places of hys booke, he tooke nature, to be one of hys principall groundes, to proue his purpose by, in thys case. And therfore he that wyll go aboute to improue and disalowe that by nature, whiche is supernaturall, shall proue hym selfe (I may saye to thee) euen as Frythe did, farre worse then a naturall foole. Wherefore herein leaue thy dreamynge of what so euer is naturall and carnall, and tourne it to that, whyche is spirituall and supernaturall an other whyle. Or els thou shall neuer haue, trew, perfit, and constante faythe in this matter, whyle thou lyuest. For so longe as thy cogytation herein, runneth or resteth vpon the common course of naturall flesche, thou shalt neuer be satisfied, wyth any trewth, that thou shalt gette and come by that waye. Therefore remember and folow the holy Apostle in that he sayeth (as I tolde thee before.)

Although we haue knowne Christe after the flesh, yet we 2.cor.5.
do not so now, for if there be (he sayth) a naturall body, 1.cor.15
there is also a spirituall body. Now be it that is not first,

whyche

» whyche is spirituall, but that whyche is naturall, and af-
» terwarde that, whyche is spirituall.

Wherefore in this matter, thou must forget naturall and fleshly flesche, and vnderstande, or at the least haue in beleefe, supernaturall and spirituall flesh. And then thou shalt, as Frithe did not, trewly vnderstand the meaning of Christe, where he sayeth.

Iohn. 6, The wordes whyche I haue spoken vnto you are spirite » and lyfe.

For spirituall vnderstanding is not here, as Frith did take it, only and mere spiritual, without all respect, and being of any maner of flesche at all. For the carnall vnderstanding, whyche he speaketh of, and layeth here to our charges, is none suche nother, as he taketh it for. He was farre deceyued in bothe. For as he tooke the one, to be onely and mere spirituall, So he tooke the o-ther to be only and whole carnal. which are bothe false, as it may well appere, and it were but by the very sub-stance of the thinge it selfe, whyche indede is flesche. But yet some way, so spiced with spiritualitee, that it is no-ther carnall, nor yet only, or mere spirituall, but spiri-tually to be vnderstande, for the spirituall state, whyche it hath obteyned.

Cap. 24.

HERE. Syr, then let me here somewhat more, whereby I may better perceyue, what spirituall vnderstandinge is. For yet I know it not. CATH It is euen that, whyche is not carnall. HERE. By that am I neuer the nere. CATH. Therefore mende thy question, and then thou mayest chaunce of a better an-

swer.

swer. HER. Then, what is carnall vnderstandinge? CATH. That is well asked. For with that, thou shouldest begyn. Because that once knowne, thou shalt know the other so muche the better. For that order in the same matter, vpon this text, the flesshe profiteth nothing, doth holy Chrisostome folow in these wordes.

Quid autem est carnaliter intelligere? simpliciter vt res dicuntur. Neq; aliud quippiam excogitare. Non enim ita iudicanda sunt quæ videntur. Sed misteria omnia interrioribus oculis considerandа, hoc est, spiritualiter. Qui non manducat carnem meam, et bibit meum sanguinem, non habet vitam in semet ipso. Quomodo nihil prodest caro, sine qua nemo potest viuere? vide quod ea perticula, caro non prodest quicquam, non de ipsa carne, sed de carnali auditione dictum est. That is to say.

But what is it to vnderstande carnally? simply as the thynges are spoken, and to imagyn therof nothing els. For those thinges which are seene, are not to be iudged so. But all mysteris are to be considered with the inwarde eyes. This is spiritually. He that eateth not my flesh, and drinke my bloud, hath not lyfe in him. How doeth the flesh profit nothing, without the whiche, no man may lyue? Marke, that this parte, the flesshe profiteth nothing, is not sayd of the flesshe it selfe, but of the carnall hearyng of it.

Here, by this, thou mayst well perceyue, that carnall vnderstandinge extendeth no farther herein then sensible experience doth leade. But spirituall vnderstanding extendeth to that, which no sensible experience is able to reache or come vnto, although it be in sensible thinges. As the grace of baptim, although it be in the sensible sacrament and ministration thereof, yet it is insensible it selfe. Farther more thou mayst here also perceyue, that

holy Chrisostome doeth not reprehende the vnderstandinge of the flesche it selfe, but the carnall hearyng of it. That is to say, the fleshly or fleshy vnderstanding of it. Whiche is, when it is taken and vnderstande after the flesche, as it is in the commen course of nature. For that, he doeth here reprehende and nothing els.

Cap. 25.

HERE. Well syr, let it so be. And wolde you haue me therefore vnderstande very flesche to be in the Sacrament? CATH. Indede I wolde haue thee beleue it. HERE. I take vnderstanding, and beleuynge to be without any great difference in this case. And therfore because this poynt runneth vpon spirituall vnderstandinge, how can I vnderstande very flesche, but that myne vnderstanding thereof, must be carnall and after the flesche, whiche I do vnderstande? CATH. Pe what flesche doest thou meane? HERE. Mary Christes flesh. CATH. I pray thee hartely vnderstande that flesh, euen after that flesche, and spare not. For so, thyne vnderstanding of it shall nother be carnall, nor yet natural nother, as carnall and naturall be communly taken. For if thou vnderstande that flesche, after that flesche indeede, thou doest then vnderstande it euen as it is, and not as it was, that is to say, as it is now, and hath bene euer since his resurrection. But not as it was, betwene that, & the first time of his incarnation. Now be it, this same carnal & after the flesh, that I meane here, is not in him, properlie called, carnall & after the flesh now, but spirituall and after the spirit. Because in him, what so euer was cõteyned vnder or in the signification of this worde carnal is

now

now turned so farre into the contrary, that it is comprehended vnder the signification of this worde spirituall. And therfore if thou vnderstande that flesshe, after as it is now, thine vnderstanding of it is then spirituall, and not carnall. HERE. Ye but although that flesshe be (as ye say) spirituall, yet it is flesshe. And therefore sithe it is flesh, how shall I know when I vnderstand it spiritually and not carnally? CATH. When thou doest vnderstand it as it is. HERE. Ye how is that? CATH. Immortall. For if thou vnderstande it otherwise then so, thou vnderstandest it carnally, and after the flesh, and not spiritually. For although immortalite commeth to the flesh, yet it commeth not of the flesshe, but of the spirit. And therefore if thou vnderstand it immortal, thine vnderstanding therof is spirituall. HERE. Of immortalitee we haue none experience. And therefore, how or by what meane, shoulde I vnderstande it immortall? For I take immortalitee to be suche a thynge as doeth farre passe my vnderstandynge and as I thynke yours to. CATH. Although it passeth my vnderstanding neuer so farre, yet so longe as it passeth not my beleueynge I do not care. but I am afrayde that it passeth not only thy vnderstandinge but also thy beleuynge to. HERE. May that it doeth not, for I beleue it verely. CATH. Then if thou do so. For the proufe of the thinge, this onely testymonie of of the holy Apostle is enoughe, where he sayeth.

Christus resurgens ex mortuis iam non moritur. Mors illi vltra non dominabitur. That is to say. Christ rysing from death, dieth no more. Death hath no more dominion ouer him.

Therfore that liuinge flesshe, whiche is aboue, and beyonde al the power of death, must needes be immortall. For although death & it, made once a fray, wherin death gat the victory and the flesshe gaue way for a litle whyle, yet soone after, that same flesshe gat the victory of death agayne, and that for euer. Wherefore if there were no more, nor anie thinge els, wherby to vnderstande it immortal, but this one testimont of thapostle, it were (as it is) sufficient & euen enoughe to any good christen man. HERE. Syr because ye speake of enough. Is it enough to vnderstand or beleue it immortall? CA. It is enough, so thou vnderstande or beleue therin, nothing to the contrary. HR. As how? CAT. No corruptiblitee, no passiblitee, no necessitee, nor any thing els to be therin, ỹ appertayneth by any occasion to the contrary. For as these do naturally appertayne and belonge vnto the state of mortalitee, so doeth their contraries, supernaturally appertayne and belonge vnto the state of immortalitee.

Cap. 26.

HERE. Then, me thinke by your sayinge, that impassibilite doth appertayne to immortalitee so, that they must needes go alway together. CATH What els? HE. Therfore if they must nedes go alway together, then the bodies that shalbe dãpned in hell for euer more, shalbe impassible. For they shalbe immortall, and neuer die. And so suffer no payne at all, if immortalitee and impassibilitee go alway together? CATH. I pray thee where foundest thou that? HERE. Where shoulde I fynde it, but euen in reason? CATH. Ye in suche reason as Frithe folowed, but not in very reason

reason in deede. For I denye that those in hell, shalbe immortall. HERE. Then they shall, and must nedes there dye agayne, and haue and ende at length. CATH. I say not so nother. HERE. They must nedes other dye agayne, and come to an ende, or els lyue for euer, and then they be immortall. For the one or the other, can not be auoyded, CATH. As farre as thou seest, thou maiest saie. How be it, I denie bothe. HERE. What, that they shall die agayne, or be immortall? CATH. That same I meane. HERE. Ye maie denie what you list, but yet I am sure, the one or the other muste needes be trew. CAT. If thou be so sure of that, then tell me what doest thou meane, or vnderstande, by this woorde immortall? HERE. Marry that, whiche is past death for euer. CATH. Naie, that is no good aunswere. For a dead dogge or a dead horse, is past death for euer, and yet is not immortall. HERE. I meane that, whiche is once past death, and yet lyueth agayne for euer. CAT. There thou saiest well. And therefore what maketh a body to lyue for euer? HERE. The obteynynge of lyfe without ende. CATH. What is lyfe without ende? HERE. Lyfe euerlastynge. CATH? Ye what is lyfe euerlastynge? HERE. I can not tell what I shoulde call it, but euen so, or euerlastynge lyfe, which is all one. CATH. Then there is nothynge that maketh bodies to lyue for euer, but euerlastynge lyfe. HERE. That is cleere. CATH. Therfore if no bodies can be immortall, but suche as lyueth for euer: And none can lyue for euer, but by euerlastynge lyfe. It foloweth playne, that it is euerlastynge lyfe, whiche

maketh bodies immortall. HERE. That I graunte must nedes be trew. CATH. And to whom is euerlastynge lyfe promised: to them that shalbe damned in
Iohn.6. hell: or els to them that shalbe saued in heauen: HER. What question is that: for euerlastinge lyfe is promised to none, but onely to those, that shalbe saued. CAT. Then, when euerlastynge lyfe is promised to none but onely to those that shall be saued, and none can be made immortall but by euerlastynge lyfe, it muste needes followe, that none but onely these that shalbe saued, can be made and trewly called immortall. And therefore why saiest thou, that those bodies shalbe immortall, whiche shall not haue euerlastynge lyfe, but shall be damned in hell for euer more: and so thereby conclude that because of their passibilitee and penall sufferynge, immortalitee and impassibilitee goeth not alway together, whiche is farre agaynste both reason and trewth. For although these damned bodies shall haue a perpetuall passibilitee and sufferynge without ende, yet they therein shall not be immortall for all that. HERE. How can those two stande together: CAT. Well enough. For once agayne, what is ment by this woord immortall, but that, whiche is not mortall: And what is not mortall properly, but that, whiche lyueth beyond and out of the daunger of death, and all the stinges therof: for there is nothing immortal but only that. And male we saie, that the damned bodies in hell, shalbe in that case: when they shall alway remayne in death: ye & in that deth, which the holy scripture calleth Mors
Apo.2.21 secunda, that is to saie, the seconde death, which male

also

also be called the death of all deathes, when it shall neuer ceasse, but be euerlastynge. HERE. Then yet ye graunte, that they shalbe, euerlastynge. CATH. Ye in death, but not in lyfe. HERE. If they be not in lyfe, they can feele no payne. CATH. That is not so. For the feelynge of payne, doth not euen properly belonge and apperteyne vnto lyfe, but vnto death. Euen as the felynge of pleasure, doth not belouge vnto death, but vnto lyfe. It is proper to death, to come by paine. And proper to life, to acquere pleasure. for the felynge, which perfect and very lyfe hath, is of none other but of pleasure. And the feling that very death hath, is of none other, but of paine. But this is sumwhat strainge, because in this world, there is none of them both. That is to saie, nother perfect life, nor yet (if I may so call it) perfect death nother. For the lyfe that we haue here now is but as it were a course vnto deth, or a mixture of both together. wherin death in conclusion preuaileth and maketh an ende of both. that is to saie, of life and it selfe to. For they both be here transitorie and temporall, but afterwarde, permanent and eternall, not mixed and confounded together, or the one folowynge the other, as they do here. But there, clerely and distinctly separate a sonder, eache from other, for euer more. HERE. Yet is it mervaile to me, how these in damnation should fele paine, if they be dead, as ye say they be. For there is no dead thynge can feele. CATH. Thou that takest one thynge for an other. For did I saie that they shall remaine deade? when I sayd none otherwyse but that they shall remaine in death. Ded and in death, are two thinges. For he that is dead, is past death & without all

maner

maner of kelyng. But so is not he, that is in death. For he is but at the poynt of dyinge, which abydynge so, is farre worse, then dead in deede. For he feleth sumwhat but what is that? In dede no pleasure, but onely paine and that extreme. Wherfore that, or so much as we see of this matter, by dayly experience here, geueth to vs good occasion of some consideracion, how it shalbe there. For although it be finished here in a short time, yet it shalbe there continuall for euer. Wherefore, say not, that those whiche shall remaine in perpetuall damnacion and miserie, shalbe therefore immortall. For that woorde properly, belongeth onely to them, that shall remaine in pleasure eternall. And therfore as those maie, and be trewly called immortall, so the other might, if the woorde were in vse, be called inuitall. For those two woordes geueth this muche to be vnderstande, that, as the one sort, nother doth nor can die. So the other, nother doth nor properly can lyue. For they be contraries. HERE. If they in hell nother do, nor can lyue, it must nedes folowe, that they haue no lyfe. CATH. How can they haue lyfe, when they are in euerlastyng death? HERE. Then that death can not greue them, if they haue no lyfe. For (as I sayd) without lyfe they can not fele. CATH. That is not so. For what is feelynge, but the sensibilitee of well or wo? That is to saie, of pleasure or payne, And therfore whereto tendeth, or belongeth the sensibilitee of payne, but vnto death, as I tolde the before? And whereto, tendeth or belongeth the sensibilitee of pleasure, but vnto lyfe? And therefore, shall, or maie we saie, that they haue in hell the sensibilitee of pleasure?

sure? God forbyd. If they haue not the sensibilitee of pleasure, they haue not that, whiche apperteyneth and belongeth properly vnto lyfe. If they haue not that whiche apperteyneth and belongeth vnto lyfe, how can we trewly saie, that they doe lyue or haue lyfe? HERE. Why syr, lyfe is one thynge, and pleasure is an other, and payne is a thyrde. Wherefore I take not lyfe of it selfe, to be other pleasure, or payne other, but onely as it were an indifferent receptacle of the other two by course, as they chaunce vnto it. CATH. Ye, that is here in this worlde, where death hath dominion ouer it. And where those contraries of pleasure and payne are confounded together for the tyme. But not so afterward in the worlde to come, where they shall be deuided, with all that properly belongeth vnto them. And so to remaine a sonder for euer more. And therfore it folowth not, that they haue lyfe, because they haue the sensibilitee and feelynge of extreme paynes, whiche (as I sayd) belongeth vnto death, and not vnto lyfe. For how should we trewly iudge lyfe in those, which we know, it were better for them, that they had neuer bene borne: as of one of them in especiall, the Gospell doth say.

Bonum erat ei, si natus non fuisset homo ille.

That is to say.

It had beene good for that man, if he had not beene borne.

If he had not bene borne, he had had no lyfe. Therfore if he haue life, and had bene better to haue had none, then it must folow, that no lyfe, is better then lyfe, which cannot be. HERE. Yes syr in some respecte. For

although lyfe muſt needes be better then no lyfe in reſpecte of it ſelfe, and in the order of nature, yet no lyfe is better then lyfe, in reſpect of him, which hath purchaſed ſuch a ſtate, that no good thinge, can do him good. Wherfore becauſe this can not be auoided, but other he hath life, or no life, and clere it is, that he hath not no life, which no life were better for him then lyfe. Therfore it muſt needes folowe, that he hath lyfe, although it be worſe for him the no life. CAT. Then I perceiue that thou wilt needes haue lyfe in them, that ſhall be damned in hell for euer. HERE. What els? CATH. Therefore ſith there is lyfe in heauen, life in earth, and lyfe in hell to, what difference wilt thou put betweene thoſe three lyues? HERE. Mery great difference. For in heauen, lyfe is indued with onelie pleaſure and no payne. In earth, with both pleaſure and alſo payne. And in hell, with onely payne and no pleaſure. CATH. What lyfe calleſt thou that whiche is alwaie indued with onely payne and no pleaſure? HERE. Such as I graunt to be worſe to them, then no lyfe at all: but yet it is lyfe for all that. CATH. If it be ſo, how commeth this to paſſe, that the holie Scripture dooth call it death? ye and geueth it to be vnderſtande euerlaſtynge, whiche is farre worſe. HERE. I ſhall tell you therein, as I thynke. becauſe death conſiſteth in extreme paynes, and paynes be there, extreme and perpetuall, therfore it mate well be ralled death, ſpecially when it hath in it no commoditee leſte, that appertayneth vnto lyfe, except it be feelynge. CATH. May excepte not that. For feelynge is no commodite but conditionall, that is to

say, if it be of pleasure, wherof they in hell haue none at all. HERE. Therfore the lyfe that they haue, maie be called death. CATH. Ye but the scriptures doth not so call it, because it maie, but because it is so. And therfore how canst thou trewly call them immortall, when they are in a death eternall? they might rather be called mortall, then immortall. How be it properly none of them both. For mortall is that, whiche shall haue a fynall death. And immortall is that, whiche shall haue none at all, but a perpetuall and a pleasant life. for neuer die, is onely in heuen. And euer die, is only in hel, wherfore sith euer die, and neuer die, be two direct contraries, this woorde immortall can neuer be trewly nor properly sayd of them bothe: for it doth exclude and vterly forbyd the vnderstandyng of all death, which hath in hell, no lesse then a perpetuall continuance for euer. Therfore sith it maie thus appere, that although those damned bodies shall haue their beyng eternall, and yet are not in deede immortall, because they shall remaine in the second death which is perpetuall, it must nedes folow, that there is no suche impediment as thou dost obiect against the going together of impassibilitee and immortalitee, but that they maie, as they are, and must nedes be, alway inseperable. Wherefore although by this occasion, thou haste caused me somewhat to dygresse from my purpose, yet to returne therevnto agayne, I say as I sayde, that as passibilitee and corruptibilitee doth apperteyne and belonge to the state of mortalitee, so doth ther contraries, that is to say, impassibilitee and incorruptibilitee appertayne and belonge to the state of immortalitee. And for

a generall rule, there is nothynge that is or maie be so vnderstande of Christes flesshe, and his bodie nowe immortall, as it is and maie be now of other mennes flesshe and their bodies, or might haue bene of his, when it was mortall.

Cap. 27.

HERE. And ye say so, we shall haue a goodly conclusion of that, eare we parte. For if there be nothynge to be vnderstande of Christes flesshe and his bodie now beynge immortall, that is or maie be vnderstande of other mennes flesshe and bodies, or might haue bene of his, when it was mortall, then we maie not vnderstande any forme, fygure, or fasshion of his bodie, nor any membres thereof, as handes, feete, eares, eies, mouthe, nose, and suche other, whiche we do well vnderstande and see, that other men haue. Whereof this must needes folow, that other he hath suche a monstrous body, as neuer was sene or harde of, or els no body at all. CATH. Thou handlest me now, euen as Frith handleth Saint Austen, and the other holy fathers of the church. And the trewth to say, as al ye do (for the most part) handle vs al in what so euer we say or wryte. For commonly, ye do not only mistake our meaninges, but also peruersly alter, and chainge our saiynges, as thou dost myne here euen now. For did I say, there is nothing that is or maie be vnderstand of christs flesshe & his body now immortal, that is & maie be vnderstand of other mennes flesshe and their bodies, or of his, when it was mortal? what a peruersion of a mans tale is this? for my saiynge was none

other

other, but that there is nothing, that is or may be so vnderstande of Christes flesshe and his body now immortal as it is and may be of other mens flesshe and of theyr bodies, or might haue bene of his, when it was mortall. Be these two tales lyke? How be it to Frithe and to thee, it is all one to say, there is nothing to be vnderstande, and to say, there is nothing to be so vnderstand. In deede by this we may vnderstand, of what generation or of what sorte of people ye are. But neuertheless, wilte thou vnderstande the figure or forme of Christes immortall bodye euen so, as thou doest, or oughtest to do euen now, of mine or thine: when the figure and forme of thine and mine, are corruptible: as they must needes be, whilse al the whole bodie is no lesse then so: Therfore how canst thou vnderstande a bodie to be immortall, and vnderstande any parte of it corruptible: when the corruption of partes tendeth to the whole. And the corruption of the whole, is death or destruction to any thinge? HER. How should I vnderstande it incorruptible, when (as I sayde of immortalite) we haue no experience of any suche incorruption? CATH. Euen as thou doest vnderstande it immortall, so vnderstand it incorruptible. For as nere to thy vnderstandinge, is the one, as the other, and all one. HERE. We haue Saynt Paule for our guyde in the one. CATH. So thou hast hym lykewyse in the other. For the body sayth he.

Is sowed in corruption, and it shall rise in incorruption. Cor. 15.

That is to say.

It is sowed in the state of corruptibilite, but it shall ryse agayne in the state of incorruptibilite.

Wherefore the figure and forme of Christes immor-

tall body, may in no wise be so vnderstande, as it is now of our bodies. HERE. That I now parceiue muste needes be graunted, as touchinge corruptibilite. CATH. Ye and as touchinge any thynge els in our bodies, what so euer it be. HERE. That were straynge. For we may vnderstande his immortall body to be sensible, that is to say, visible, palpable, and of a certayne stature and quantite as other mens are. CATH. Beware what thou doest. For wilt thou vnderstand the sensibilite of his bodie, to be subiect to the sensis of men, and to the actions of other naturall thinges, as the sensibilite is of our bodies? HERE. How els? CATH. What, when so many displeasures chaunceth to men therof, as we may dayly see? doest thou not know, that by our sensibilite we be made subiect to passibilite? for what corporall passion or payne coulde be put vnto vs, by any man, or other body, if we could not be hard, seen, touched, or felt? or what penal suffering could touche vs, but by our senses of hearing, seyng, or felyng? Therfore by our senses or sensibilite, we come to passibilite & suffring, and by passibilite & suffring we come to death and corruption. There is no man I suppose, that hath the stature and quantite of his body so, but that he wolde, some time, for one cause or other, haue it other more, or lesse, or otherwise then he hath, yf he myght. If not, yet who doeth not know it to be subiect to diuision, which tendeth to corruption, and so to destruction? therfore wilt thou vnderstand the forme, figure, stature, quãtite, senses, & sensibilite of christes body after this sorte, & as thou doest & muste needes vnderstãd them in, & of other mens bodies? if thou so do, wout question, thine vnderstandinge of it then, is but carnall & af-

ter

ter the flesh, And not spiritual and after the spirit, & therfore not accordyng to ỳ scriptures before alledged. For so thyne vnderstanding walketh not, but wtin the compasse of sensible experience, whiche can not reache, to the state of immortalite, nor to any thinge nere it. For so long, as thou vnderstandest any poynt in that body so, as ỳ doest and must vnderstand it in ours, without faile thou doest not vnderstand it immortall, but as it were mortall stil, although, or what so euer thou doest thinke, or phansy to the contrary. For what is in our bodies, ỳ is not subiecte to dissolution, corruption, and mortalite: And what is so contrarie to immortalite as those thinges are: therfore thou shalt neuer trewly vnderstand Christes body to be immortal, so longe as ỳ demist vpon any thing to be in it, as it is naturall. Because it is not in parte, but euen whole supernaturall altogether.

Cap. 28.

HER. I wene ye wold make vs vnderstand him to haue no body at al. CA. why sayst thou so. HER. How should I vnderstand him to haue a body, & vnderstand not the forme, figure, stature, colour, quantite, and suche other accidentall qualites therof, as I do of other mens bodies: CA. Because he hath those thinges now, far otherwise & after an other sorte in hys body, then other men hath them in theirs. HER. How is that: CAT. Ye that how, is it, that leadeth you al. But yet so much of that how, as my poore vnderstandinge can reache, and thine can beare, I will tell thee. Other men hath their accidentall qualities, not subiecte to their willes, but to the order of nature. And he hath them, not subiecte to the order of nature, but to hys wyl, whyche

is

is in a farther liberte, and the fardeſt that may be. HERE. I do not well vnderſtande your meanynge therin. CATH. That is this. Thou ſtandinge here now preſently before me, I do ſee in thee, all theſe thynges that we ſpeake of. That is to ſay, thy forme, fauour, colour, ſtature, quantite, and ſo forth, by reaſon wherof it is trew, after the common vnderſtandinge, that I ſee thee. HERE. I graunt no leſſe. CATH. Therefore what if thou woldeſt not, that I ſhoulde ſee thee now, being thus preſent before me: couldeſt thou with draw the viſible apparence of theſe thinges from my ſight, yf I luſt to beholde them in thee? HERE. I coulde not do ſo thoughe I wolde, ſo longe as I ſtande before you. CATH. Therfore thou haſt them not, ſubiect to thy will when thou canſt not vſe them accordinge to thy wyll. Wherefore by this it appereth playne, that when thou art ſeen, and parchaunce woldeſt not be ſeen, theſe thinges in thee then are therin but reſyders of thy wyll, and not folowers therof. And therefore, god forbyd that we ſhuld vnderſtande them to be ſo, and after that ſorte, in the bleſſed bodie of our Sauyour Chriſte. Wherfore, other he hath them not at all, or els he hath them ſubiect to his holy will. And parell it were to thinke, that he hath them not at all, becauſe it is ſo harde to vnderſtande, how a very body may haue any beynge without them. And more parill it is to thinke, that he hath them in his body, as we haue them in ours, whiche are tending to corruption. But no parill at al, to thinke y he hath them ſubiect, and at the becke of his holy wil, to vſe or not vſe them after this or that ſorte, alway at hys pleaſure. That is to ſay, to ſhew them or not ſhow them, or him ſelf by them,

when,

when, where, and as it shall please hym. For yf it were his glorious pleasure to stande here now betwene vs bothe, thynkest thou that we shoulde see these thinges in hym, as in like case, we shoulde see them in other, and aske them no leaue: or that his very beyng betwene vs, should let thy seyng of me, or my seynge of thee, as an other mans direct being betwene vs should do, whether we or he wolde or not, except it were his holy pleasure so to do: And therfore, because the altitude of this matter, extendeth so farre beyonde the common reache of our reason, and vnderstandinge, how to auoyde euery how, that hath, is, or may chaunce to be hurled agaynst it, but with other like howes of the same sorte, it pleased hym of his infinit goodnesse, for the corroboration of the verite of our fayth herin, to leue vnto vs, in his holy scripture, some, ye and sufficient examples therof. For how dyd the ponderosite of his holy bodye behaue it selfe, when he walked vpon the water: did it not there, forsake the common order of nature, and submit it selfe wholy and only to his will: How did the visible forme, of his whole body, (wherein al these thinges were contayned) behaue it self, when the Iewes wolde haue horled stones at him in the temple, if they had not suddenly lost their sight of it: did not also that, euen there then, leaue the order of nature, and folow his only wyll likewyse: mo plates diuerse there be, for the purpose, whiche shal not neede to be recited now: Therefore if he had these accidentall qualites of hys body, so obedient vnto his wyll, that he myght as he dyd, vse them at hys pleasure, contrarie and agaynst all the rules of nature, (he beinge then, in a mortall state, and they of them selues in a na- John. 6 John. 8

turall course, how muche more now and euer since are they subiecte to his will, he hauinge his body glorified, and in a state immortall: wherin, they are also chaynged, from what so euer the state of mortalite in them requered. Wherfore, if he hath them (not as we haue of necessite) but as the trewth is, at hys liberte, to vse, or not vse them (as I sayde before) when, where, and how so euer therein hys holy wyll and pleasure is and shalbe, where are all your knappyshe and sorneful cauillations become, that ye, by the natural course of these thynges, make agaynst hys reall and very presence in the holy Sacrament: saying, what: so longe and large a body, with hãdes, feete, armes legges, hed, heere, backe and belly, in so litle a rowme and space, as the Sacrament is of: and yet more ouer, nother see him nor feele him nother: who wolde beleue thys: In deede none of you, whiche frame your beleuynge, after your sensible seing and feelynge. But nenertheless, what are all these cauillations of yours to the purpose: all these I say, wyth other, of some of you, more shamefully inuented, then of vs, conuenientlỹ may be recyted: Therfore what if thou thy selfe, haddest the sensible forme of thy bodie, at the liberte of thyne owne wyll, to show or not show it, how, when, and where thou liste: woldest thou not sometyme be so amonge men, that nother by their seynge, nor yet by theyr feelynge, they should beware of thee: And when thou were so amonge them after that sorte, wolde it folow that thou were not there, because they coulde not se thee, nor feele thee: Therefore by these your owne obiections, it appereth playne, that your cogitations and

vnderstandynges therein, runneth not, but directly and only after the flesshe, and not after the spirite. Ye and that after the fleshly flesshe, without any sparke or respecte, of any spirituall flesshe at all. Wherein lieth so muche of the matter, as caused the Holy Apostle to saye.

Although we haue knowne Christ after the flesh, yet we do not so now. 2.cor.5.

That is to say.

Not now after as it was, when he walked in it here in yerthe accordyng to the course of nature, and so therein suffered at lengthe. But now after the spirite, and as the spirite had obteyned it, when and before he sitting in Emmaus with the two of hys dysciples, showed him selfe vnto them, syrste in one forme, whereby they knew him not, and immediatly after in an other, whereby they knew hym in deede, And yet there vpon so suddenlye vanished away from theyr syght, that bothe they and also we, myght and may thereby vnderstande and perceyue, how very subiecte and obedient his sensible forme, was and is, vnto his holy will, to vse, thys way or that way, at hys only pleasure. Therefore it foloweth not, that he is not presently and verely in the holy Sacrament, because he suffreth vs not, therein sensibly to se him, nor feele him. But this foloweth well, that because he suffreth vs not, to haue any suche sensible experience of him therein, we be so muche the more bounde, therefore to thanke hym, as all the merit and profit of our faythe commeth to, in that holy mistery. Wherein, amonge all other artycles, faythe is in none (as I thynke) more excellent and necessarie. Wherefore, thys thou hast nowe harde euen more

then enoughe, to perceyue how farre Frithe was (for all his babling pretence of the contrary) from the very spirituall vnderstandynge of this great mystery. And thorow his lacke of that, and of good will together, what blinde and dampnable falshed he fell into, bothe in hys vnderstanding of the Scripture, and also of Saynt Austen likewyse, I thynke I haue declared vnto thee so muche therof, that thou canst not with reason, require anie more, wherby thou mightest any better know what he was, then by thys that I haue showed thee all redy.

Cap. 29.

HERE. Why say you so? for be you well assured he hath yet one other place of Saint Austen for his purpose, whyche passeth all that we haue spoken of hytherto. CATH. I pray thee what is that? HERE. In the 23. and the. 24. leafe of hys booke, he doeth vpon this sayinge of Christe.

» He that eateth my flesshe and drinketh my bloud, bydeth » in me and I in hym.

Alledge Saynt Austen in these wordes.

» Qui manducat carnem meam, & bibit meum sangui- » nem, in me manet & ego in illo. Hoc est ergo mandu » care illam escam & illum bibere potum, in christo ma » nere et illum manentem in se habere, ac per hoc, qui » non manet in Christo, & in quo non manet Christus » procul dubio non manducat eius carnem nec bibit sã- » guinem, etiamsi tantæ rei Sacramentum, ad iuditium » sibi manducat & bibit. That is to say.

» He that eateth my flesshe and drynketh my bloud, abideth » in me, and I in him. This is therfore the eatinge of that meate,

meate, and drinking of that blood, to abyde in christe, and to haue him abydynge in vs. And therfore he that abideth not in Christe, and in whom Christe abideth not, without doubt he eateth not his flesshe nor drynketh his blood, although he eate and drinke the sacramente of so great a thynge vnto his damnacion.

And vpon this, Fryth him selfe hath these woordes. This one place (saith he) is sufficient to proue my purpose though he saide not one woord more. For here he doth plainely determyne, that he which abideth not in Christe, That is to saie, he that is wicked or vnfaithfull, doth not eate his fleashe nor drynke his blood, although he eate and drynke the sacrament of so great a thynge. And so must it needes folow, that the sacrament is not the very naturall body of Christe, for then the vnfaithfull shoulde eate his fleshe, seynge he eateth the sacrament of his body.

How saie you now? CATH. Is this all? HERE. No not so, For although this be enough, yet he hath more. CATH. Let vs then haue it altogether. HERE. In the same leafe, Fryth goeth farther with these woordes.

This saiyng (saith he) hath sainte Austen in an other place also, where he writeth in this maner.

Qui non in me manet, & in quo nō ego maneo, nō se dicat aut existimet manducare corpus meū, aut bibere sanguinem meum. Non itaq; manent in Christo qui non sunt eius membra. Non sunt autem membra Christi qui se faciunt membra Meretricis.

That is to say.

He that bideth not in me, And in whom I abide not, let him not saie, or thynke, that he eateth my bodye or drinketh my blood. They abide not in Christe, which are not his membres. And they are not his membres, which make them selues the membres of an harlot.

And these (saith Frith) are also the very woords of Bede.

Wherunto he addeth of his owne woordes these.
» Here is it plaine (saith he) proued againe by the auctorite of
» S. Aust. and Bede, that the wicked and vnfaithfull (which
» are not the membres of Christe) do not eate his bodie nor
» drynke his blood. And yet they do eate the sacrament as
» well as the other. Wherefore you must needes graunte
» (saith he) that the sacrament is not the naturall bodie of
» Christe, but a sygure, token, or memoriall thereof.

Now sir, do you marke well these places of S. Austen, and what Frith doth here gather of them? CATH. Yc, very well. HERE. Then I pray you say now euen as you thinke: do they not euen cleane ouerthrow, the principall purpose of what so euer ye haue said before? CA. In dede I wold graunt no lesse, if they had in them, none other meaning, but this that frith pitcheth out of his own heretical dreaming. HER. His heretical dreaming? what meane you by that? CATH. I will tell the so thou wilt first consider his old foolishe accustomed conclusion, which he doth here inferre and renew againe, and that in both these places. HERE. What conclusion is that? CATH. Be not these his woordes?
It must needes follow, and ye must needes graunt, that the sacrament is not the naturall body of christe.
what is this to his purpose, of the not beyng of Christes very body in the sacrament? to be, and to be in, is all one with him. Whereof I haue tolde the enough before. And therefore, what fyndest thou els in anie of these two places of Saint Austen, that can make any thynge for his purpose? HERE. I wonder that ye will aske me that question, sith they make so muche and so cleerely for him as they do. For whether you take the sacrament it selfe, to be the very body of Christ, or Chri-

Ges

ſes very body to be verily in it, theſe places maketh directly againſt you in them both. CATH. How ſo? HERE. Doth not the firſt place ſay (as Frith hath declared) that, to eate Chriſtes fleſhe, and drynke his blood, is to abide in him, and he in vs: and by that, he that abydeth not in Chriſte, nor Chriſte in him, eateth not his fleſh nor drinketh his blood, although he eate and drinke the ſacrament thereof. Now this beinge plaine enough, yet to confirme the ſame, doth not the ſeconde place ſay alſo, let not him ſay or thynke, that he eateth my body or drynke my blood, which abideth not in me, and in whom I abyde not: Therfore they abyde not in Chriſte, which are none of his membres. And they are none of his membres, which maketh them ſelues the membres of an harlot. And yet cleere it is, that ſuch wicked perſons, doth often times eate and drynke the ſacrament. Wherfore, if other the ſacrament it ſelfe, were Chriſtes verie body and blood, or his very body and blood were verely in it, it ſhulde and wolde nedes folow, that ſuche wicked lyuers and vnfaythfull perſons, as neuer abyde in Chriſte, nor he in them, whiche doe daiely eate the ſacrament, ſhoulde therin eate his very bodye, and drynke his blood. And that doth Saint Auſten in bothe places vtterly deny.

Cap. 10.

CATH. What doth he deny? HERE. Marry that ſuch wicked perſons do eate the very body of Chriſt, when they eate the ſacrament. CAT. And therof wilt thou infer, that the very body of chriſt is not in the ſacrament? HE. what els? for that muſte nedes folow.

folow. CATH. Saint Austen saith not so. HER. No, not in those woordes, but yet he saith as much as that commeth to. For if the very body of Christe were verely in the sacrament, then should those wicked persons, that abydeth not in Christe, nor Christe in them, eate his very body, when they eate the sacrament. CATH. And euen so they do in deede. HERE. Will you say so, when Saint Austen saith plainly nay? CATH. And so say I to. HERE. What ye and nay? eate and not eate one thynge both at once? CAT. Ye why not? HERE. Nay, then it is tyme, to make an ende, and euen to byd you farwell, if ye talke after that sorte. CATH. If thou so do, thou doest therein but as it is common with suche as thou art. For ye will be sure to shake of a matter (if ye maie) when ye haue most nede to herken well to it. HERE. Who wouldo not shake of suche a talke as ye make? for how can the eatynge and not eatynge of one thynge, both at once, stande together? CATH. Although I haue tolde the before, yet once againe I will tell the how, if Fryth (or thou for him) will tell me one thynge that I will aske the. HERE. What is that? CATH. I would know what maner of eatynge this is, that Saint Austen both meane, and here speake of? HER. Tushe sir, I praie you go not about the bushe with any such questions, but go directly to the matter, and there an ende. CATH. Calleste thou that a goyng about the bushe, to trie certeinly what a man dooth meane, by that he saith? HERE. Ye sir when the woordes be so plaine as nedeth it not. For Saint Austen saith, that those persons doth not eate the body nor flesh of Christe, when

they

they eate the sacrament. And what wolde ye haue more plainly spoken then that is? CATH. I graunt it to be both plainely spoken, and also trewly. But yet nother plainely nor trewly nather, as Frith doth take it. For he taketh it not to be spoken, but of the very reall eatynge of it, whiche in deede is vtterly false, and directly against that, whiche I tolde the, of Saint Austens owne saiynge before. where he saith,

Christe for our health, hath geuen vs the same flesshe to eate, wherin he walked here in earth, and the same flesshe, that he tooke of the virgin Mary.

And where did he (as I said before) geue vs that flesshe to eate, but in the holy sacrament? And therefore who so euer dooth eate the sacrament, must nedes also therin, eate that flesshe, or els that saiynge of Saint Austen can not be trew. Wherefore this is directlye againste Frithes vnderstandyng of these two later places: which thou hast recited. Whereby we maie well perceiue, that Saint Austen ment not in them, as Frith doth take him. For if he did, he shoulde be in this one place, directly agaynst him selfe in the other two places. Whiche in so weighty a matter, god forbyd to be thought of S. Austen: whose moste excellent witte, learning and holynesse, hath reigned and florished so longe in suche an honorable estimacion, as it hath most worthely done. For herein, if he had so ment as Frith doth take him, then in him there should haue bene verified this notable saiynge of the Apostle.

Modicum fermentum totam massam corrumpit.

That is to say.

A little leauen corrupteth the hole lumpe of dow.

Therefore, Saint Austen was to wise, to well lerned, and to happie, to ouer shoote him selfe in this great matter, with any crum of the leuen of this contradiction. Which were enough to deface all his doyng herein, and him selfe to. Wherfore it can not be auoyded, but this is enough, whereby thou maiest be sure, that frith dooth falsely vnderstande these two places of Saint Austens, as he doth all the rest before. HERE. I wyll here more care I graunt so much. For how so euer ye auoyde this contradiction in Saint Austen yet I am sure ye can not auoyde the contradiction that is herein betweene hym and you. For here he saith plainely that the wicked, whiche abyde not in Christe, nor Christe in them, doth not eate Christes body nor his flesshe, although they eate the sacrament therof. And you say here as plainely, that they do eate it. And what is this but eatyng and not eatynge one thynge both at once. And what is that, but plaine contradiction, which in no wise can stande together? CAT. Why so? HER. Who knoweth not why? CATHO. That is euen I. For doost not thou know, that in dayly common meates, eating is ordeined onely, to mans commoditee and profite, And not to his hurt or hinderance, although they be dately, very muche abused? HERE. All that I graunt to be trew. CAT. And doth it not sometyme chaunce, that the hole man and the sicke man, eating of one meate, the one eateth it to his profyte, and the other to his hurt? HERE. What of that? CAT. If the sicke mans eatyng, who taketh nothinge but hurt and hinderaunce therof, should come in question, or be asked whether he doth eate any thing

or

or not, will it not, nor male it not, be rightlie answered and sayde, that he eateth nothynge? When he taketh not that therein, whiche eatynge is chieflie or onely ordeyned for? In so muche that if one will saye, he dooth eate, wyll not an other say, what eatynge call ye that, whiche dooth more hurte then good? ye rather no good at all, but muche hurt, when the eater is neuer the better for it, but the worse: For, is that eatynge worthy, or meete to be called eatynge, which is not onely without all the commoditee and profite of eating, but also doth purchase far more hurte and hinderaunce, then not eatynge. Therefore although in respecte of the thynge eaten the sycke man dooth eate the verie same meate, whiche the hole manne dooth eate, yet because he dooth not eate it, with that inwarde effecte and profyte of it, that the hole man dooth eate it with all, it male well be sayde and stande with reason, that he eateth not, because that whiche he dooth, is but in vayne. For although eatynge bee commonly taken and vnderstande of the meate and outwarde maner of receyuynge thereof, yet it male as well and better be vnderstande of the verie inwarde commodytee and profyte thereof, for whiche profyte only, the outwarde eatynge is prepared and ordeyned, as it is plaine, when without, ỳ the other doth nothing (as I sayd) but greatly hurt and hinder, although the faute and cause therof, be not in the meat taken, but onely in the state of the taker. Wherfore, if a man wolde sale, (as ryght well he might) that the sicke man eateth

not, meaninge in respect of the commoditee and profite, that eatynge is ordeyned for, yet of that eatynge it followeth not, but that he dooth eate of the verie same meate, that the hole man dooth eate, for all that. For the name of eatynge dooth include the vnderstandyng, not only of the outwarde maner of eatynge, but also and most cheefly, of the inward cõmoditee and fruict full profite therof, which is the very dew ende, wherunto the other is not ordeined but only to serue. And therfore of eating, that same dew ende, doth most worthely beare the name, as it doth somtime, and euen spetially now in this case, where it is, of no more mente, but euen of that alone. So that betwene these two respectes, that is to sale, of the outwarde eatynge, without profite, and of the inwarde eating, wherin consisteth all the profite therof, there is both eating and not eating of one thing, and that both at once. The one by it selfe alone, euyll and hurtfull: and the other, good and effectuall. Therfore likewise in our case, of this effectuall eatynge it is, that Saint Austen dooth here speake of. For doth he not in these two forsayde places, speake onely of those eaters. which abyde not in Christe, nor Christe in them? HERE. That I graunt. CATH. And may we not thinke, that Christe is our helth? HERE. May we not? May what ought we more, to thinke and say, then that? CATH. Therfore if Christe be our helth, those that abide not in him, abide not in helth. HERE. That is trew. CATH. And those that abyde not in helth, who can say but they be sicke? HERE. It foloweth plaine. CA. And those that are sicke, although they eate the same meate, that other doth, euen really,

yet

yet for all that, they eate not the same meate that other doeth, effectually and profitably. And that eatynge only it is, whiche Saint Austen doeth here denie, and none other. and yet not with standing, that he denieth not here but only that eatinge of Christes very body, whiche fayleth not in deede, but only in those, that abyde not in Christe, nor Christe in them, because they abuse them selues so wickedly, Frith wolde needes for all that, vnderstande hym, as thoughe he had denied that eatinge therof, whiche houldeth and is in all of lawfull age, bothe good and bad euen generally. And therfore herein, how false his vnderstanding is, it may well appere by thys that Saint Austen maketh here no mention of the whole multitude of eaters therof in generall, but onlye of one parte of them, whiche are but a certayne sorte in speciall.

Cap. 31.

HERE. May then it is tyme to geue ouer, yf ye make so many eatinges of Christes body. CATH Why how many? HERE. Mary syr ye make twayne. CATH. I make none, but yet because thou speakest of twayne, in deede there be three. HER. Three: whiche three be they? CATH. One is only spirituall. An other is only reall. And the thirde is, bothe reall and spirituall together. HERE. How so? CATH The only spirituall eatinge, is in them, that hauynge a well purged conscience with a penitente harte and a perfit faythe, wolde fayne receyue the holy Sacrament and can not. But letted, as perchaunce in sickenes, with the lacke of time, or with the feble weakenes of stomake,

whiche some time is not able to keepe that it taketh, or letted wyth anie other impediment, whereby they can not, or conuentiently may not haue it. And the only reall eatinge, is in those, that receueth the holy Sacramente not abiding in Christ, nor christ in them, because of their peruerse behauour and wicked state. Of whome onlye (as I sayd) and of their not eating, Saynt Austen doeth here speake, and of none other. Thirdly, the eating both reall and spirituall together, is in them that doeth receyue the holy Sacrament, not only actually, and therefore therin the body of christ really, as the naughty sorte doeth, but also in a right fayth, with a pure conscience, & a contrite harte, spiritually, as the other for lacke therof doth not. Wherefore, of Christes blessed body, this many maner of eatinges there be. HER. Then I perceyue, that ye take, to be at the least, one eatinge of it spirituall and an other corporall, some time a sonder, & sometime bothe together. CATH. That worde corporall, to be put there, not borowed, but euen properly spoken and vnderstand as it is cõmonly taken in euery condition, I dare not graunt. HER. Why so? CAT. Although it be harde to tell the why, for thynsufficiẽcie of our englishe tongue yet for the best declaration therof, that I can make, thou shalt vnderstande, that for this latyn worde Corpus, we haue this englyshe worde, bodye. And for this latyn worde Corporale (which commeth of Corpus) because we haue no proper Englishe worde for that, we borrow therof this worde corporall, whiche geueth any thynge to be vnderstande, partayninge to a body, according to the order of nature, as accidentall qualites doeth. And farther more lykewyse, for this latyn worde Caro, we

haue

haue thys Englishe worde, flesh. But for this latin worde carnale (whiche commeth of caro) because we haue no Englishe worde for that nother, so proper as is able euen aptly and fully to counteruayle the signification therof, we therfore borrow of it, this worde carnall, as we do of corporale, corporall. Which wordes, both corporall and carnall, although they be no Englishe wordes properlie, yet by vse, they are growne into suche acquayntaunce wyth many, (although not learned in the latin tongue) that they know, or haue a great gesse, what they meane and signifie. And that in thys case, is what so euer (as I sayd) partayneth to a body or flesshe naturally. Whiche some doeth Englishe wyth these wordes, bodylie and fleshlie, although those be the proper Englishe wordes, not of corporale and carnale, but of corporaliter and carnaliter, whyche doeth some what differ from corporale and carnale. Therefore when we eate the blessed body of christ in the holy sacrament, we may no more say, that we eate it corporally or bodyly (and yet eate it verily). Then, when we eate therein (as we do in deede) hys verie flesshe, we maye say therof, that we eate it carnallie or fleshly. For so we eate it, as we ought to vnderstand it. And we ought not to vnderstād it carnally, nor fleshly. For if we do, then we vnderstand it after the flesh, which the doctrine of the holie apostle dothe vtterly forbid, as I haue declared vnto thee al redy. And therefore as the flesshe, and after the flesshe, is two thinges. So the body, and after the bodie is to thinges likewise. And as the vnderstandinge of the flesshe after the flesshe, is none other but to vnderstande it carnallye or fleshelie, So the vnderstandinge of the

body

body after the body, is none other, but to vnderstande it corporally or bodyly. Wherfore, as it is proued bothe by Saynt Austen and also by Saynt Paule before, that we may not vnderstande Christes holy flesshe after the flesh, that is to say, not carnally nor fleshly, so we may not vnderstande his blessed body, after the body nother, that is to say, not corporally nor bodyly. For after one rule, they must be vnderstande bothe of them, whiche rule the holie apostle doeth geue vs, where he saythe (as before is alledged.)

2.cor.5, Although we haue knowne christe after the flesshe, yet we, do not so now.

Therfore if we may not know Christe now, after the flesshe, we may not now, vnderstand him after the flesh. For we can not knowe him one way, and vnderstande him an other way. Therefore if we may not vnderstand him after the flesshe, then we may not vnderstande hym after the body. For that is flesshe. Wherfore as it is none other to vnderstande him after the flesshe, but to vnderstande him carnally or fleshly, so it is none other (as I sayde before) to vnderstande him after the body, but to vnderstand him corporally or bodely. And for that cause, as we are by the apostle, forbyd the vnderstandinge of him after the one, so we are likewise in the same, forbyd the vnderstanding of him after the other. And therefore, how wolde'st thou haue me graunte a corporall eatinge of Christes body, or to be eaten corporally, whē we may not vnderstande it corporally? for we may not eate it after one sorte, and vnderstande it after an other, least we make a discrepance or a variete in the thinge, whiche in the verite of it selfe, is none other in our eatinge, then

in

in our vnderſtandinge, nor in our vnderſtandinge, then in our eatinge of it, but all one. For although a body can not be by nature corporally or bodyly, except it be verylie, yet, by poſſibilite, it may be verely, although it be not corporally or bodely, but as Chriſtes body in the Sacrament is. For verely, riſeth of the ſubſtaunce. And corporally or bodely riſeth of the naturall qualites thervnto annexed. Whiche in hys bleſſed body are ſupernaturally chaynged. And therefore it is ſufficient for vs to beleue, that (as the trewth is) we eate his body in the Sacrament verely, although we eate it not corporally or bodylie. That is to ſay, not after a corporall or a bodylie maner, becauſe to be eaten of vs, it nether doeth nor yet needeth, to behaue it ſelfe after that ſorte.

Cap. 32.

HERE. Why ſyr, how is it poſſible to be trew, but that, when it is eaten verely, it muſt needes be eaten corporally and bodylie? for a very body, muſt be very bodylie eaten, or els it can not be eaten in deede. CATH. That I graunte, when it is eaten after the common courſe of naturall eating, but els not. HERE. If it be verely eaten in deede, it can none otherwyſe be eaten but euen ſo? CATH. That is not trew. HERE. Why, what call you, eaten after the common courſe of naturall eatinge? CATH. When that whiche is eaten, is or may be ſeen, felt, taſted, and eaten ſenſibly, for then therin, the order of nature hath his courſe, and bareth rule. HERE. And do not I ſee feele and taſte what I eate, when I eate the Sacramente? CATH.

That is an other matter, for I speake not this that I say now, of the Sacrament, but of a very body. HERE. why is not the Sacrament a very body? CATH. No trewly. HERE. That herde I neuer before. CATH. I wolde thou hadest had no neede to here it now. HERE. What neede so euer I haue had, I haue alwaye taken the Sacrament to be a very corporall thynge. CATH. And euen so it is. HERE. Why, ye say it is not a body. CATH. So I say stil. HERE. How can a thinge be corporall and be not a bodie? for a body can not be but corporall, nother anie thing be corporall, but a body. CAT. Thy dreame runneth not, but alway vpon the common course of nature. And yet euen therin thou art deceyued to: for quantite is a corporall thinge, but yet not corpus that is to say, not a bodie for all that, but in, or of a body as a certayne thinge appertayning vnto it. Also colour is a corporall thinge to, but yet not corpus, or a body nother. And so likewise of forme, figure, and all other sensible obiectes and qualites what so euer they be. for euery one of them is corporall, and yet none of them corpus or a bodie, but only pertayning or naturally belonginge to a body. And therefore they are called corporall qualites. HERE. Then belike, ye cal that corpus or a body, wher in all those thinges be. CATH. No not so nother. For we cal that, substance, and not a body. HER. Then what call you a body? CATH. Not substance by it selfe, nor those accidentall quantites and qualites by them selues nother, but substance and they ioyned naturally together. For then it is corpus, that is to say, a body, or els in the order of nature, no very body indede. And therfore this worde corporall, serueth so indifferently to them

that it may be sayd some tyme of the one, and some time of the other. That is to say, some tyme of the substance, and some time of thaccidentall quantite and qualites.

HERE. And why not of them bothe or all together?

CATH. Because it is then, corpus, or a body, whych worde commonly, in the course of nature, extendeth in signification properly, to no lesse then all the whole together, and not to any of the partes particulerly by them selues. HERE. Yet then I may say, that the Sacrament it selfe is at the least a corporall substance, although he it be (as you say) not a body. CATH. How canst thou say so, when it lacketh nothinge els of a bodye but onlie that? For there is none other cause why, that it is not a bodie, but because it hath not a proper substance, as other quantites and qualites hath, wherein they be. HERE. If it be not a corporall substance, how coulde I see and feele it as I do? CA. As thou seest and feelest all other corporal thinges. Wherof, any corporal substance, thou neuer sawest in al thy life. For it is but only the quantites & qualites that thou or any man els, doeth or can se of any thinge, & not the substance it selfe, which is alway of it selfe and by it selfe insensible. HERE. Yet by those qnantites and qualites, I do suerly know, that there is a substance, wherin they be, when I see them.

Cap. 33.

CATH. In that thou must except the holy Sacrament. Which is alone, and without the like, among all sensible thinges that are in our knowledge. Of the whiche Sacrament, what if I wolde say this, that the same whiche we see, is a corporall thynge, and

not a body. And yet hath in it a body, that is not corporall? HERE. If ye wolde so say, it were strayngely spoken. Howbe it, if you wolde so say in deede, your meaning therof, I wolde take to be this. That there, is corporalite without a body. And a body without corporalite. CATH. Take it euen so? HERE. Then ye meane the corporallite without a body, to be of the Sacrament in the only respecte of it selfe. And the body without corporalite, to be the thynge of the Sacrament, whiche you say, is the very body of Christe really and presently conteyned therin. Is it not this that ye meane? CATH. Forth with thy purpose, and then I will tel thee more. HER. My purpose is this. If Christes very body in the Sacrament, be without corporalite, beinge the same bodie (as you say it is) whiche is in heauen, it must needes folow that Christes bodie in heauen, is of no corporall substance. For without corporalite, there can be no substance corporall. And therefore consequently, yf it be of no corporall substance, then it is no body at all. For without, a corporall substance, no bodie can be. CATH. First whether thou put the case of his blessed body, in heauen, or els in the holy Sacrament, all that is one to me. For I put no difference betwene them in the verite thereof, but that it is the very same in the one place, that it is in the other. And therfore if thou put thys worde corporall to that substance, for to show a distinction or a difference betwene the substance thereof, and the incorporall substance of an Angell or a spirite, I holde well wyth all. HERE. And wyth no cause els but only that? CATH. Yes trewly, and that is thys. If thou put it also to that substance, and call it corporall, meanynge it to be

corpo-

corporall, by reason of a supernartual connection of that substance, and suche supernaturall quantitee and qualitees together, as are beyonde al therperience and reche of any mortall mans wit, reason, or vnderstandyng, I holde so well with that to, that I will here none of you all, what so euer ye wolde feyne or say to the contrarie. But if thou meane it corporall, by reason of any suche mortall, and corruptible quantitee and qualitee, as there is none other in thy body and myne, or in any other mortall creature liuynge, I deny it vtterly to be corporall so, or to haue so muche as any beynge, other in the sacrament or in heauen other, after that sorte. For your dreamyng of suche maner of corporalitee in him, is also an other cause why, then I tolde the of before, that these madde, and hereticall phansies hath rysen among you, saiyng and askyng, what, Christes very body presently in the sacrament? what, so great a quantitee in so little a space? what, before my face and see it not? what, haue it in my handes and fele it not? what, receiue it, eate it, and taste it not? what, here and there one body in so many places at once? who wolde beleue this? And so ye conclude with your capteyne Fryth, where he saith in the .76. leafe of his booke,

It is no article of our crede (saith he) and therfore let them, beleue it that will.

A goodly conclusion and euen lyke not onely him selfe, but also all the rest of his folowers. How be it, by this it maie well appere, what maner of fruictes they bee, whiche ye haue gathered out of suche corporalitee in Christe, as ye dreame alway vpon in your selues. And no meruaile why, when ye will nedes make your

ble senses (whiche beguildeth you dayly) to be the iudges and guydes of your faith, in suche diuine misteries.

Cap. 34.

HERE. Why sir, be there not of your sorte, and euen in the same beleue that you be of, that doth both say and wryt, that Christe hath euen now, a naturall body, and that it is of a corporall substaunce? CATH. I graunt no lesse. But what of that? thinkest thou therfore, that when they cal his body a natural body, they meane it suche a naturall body as ours are, within the compasse and common order of nature? or when they call it a corporall substance, that they meane it corporal, by reason of any such corporall quantitees & qualites as our bodies hath, which bodies are yet, by the & with them, subiect vnto death and corruption? HER. If they do not so mean, why do they put those wordes naturall and corporall to it, whiche dooth none otherwise signifie: and not rather forbyd them to be vsed, when the significatiō of them, is to their meaning so contrary? CATH. I shall tell the why. Fyrste, because there be no proper woordes for the thinges that they meane by them, except they should call naturall supernatural, and corporall supercorporall. Wherof allthough supernaturall, hath some vse monge them that be learned, yet is it farre, both from the vse and also the vnderstandynge of them, that be vnlearned. But as for this woorde supercorporall, playne it is, that that was neuer in vse among the vnlearned, nor yet among the learned nother, because there is not founde any suche

woorde

woꝛd of that compoſicion. HERE. Then were they beſt, to bꝛinge both thoſe woꝛdes into an vſe, whereby they might expꝛeſſe directly what they meane, and not there, to vſe thoſe other woꝛdes, whiche dooth ſignify the contrary oꝛ inſufficientlie. CATH. No not ſo. foꝛ where they put this woꝛd naturall, if they ſhoulde put ſupernaturall, and where they put coꝛpoꝛall, if they ſhoulde put ſupercoꝛpoꝛall, althoughe moſte of ſuch as be learned, coulde well awaie with all, yet the greate multitude of the vnlearned, ſhould by that, be rather pꝛouoked to the miſtruſt and doubt of the verytee of the thynge, then to the fyꝛme credence and faſt beleefe therof, if ſuche ſtraynge woꝛdes, were ſoyned vnto it, as they foꝛ lacke of knowledge were not able to vnderſtande, noꝛ coulde awaie withall. Foꝛ thoſe woꝛds ſupernaturall and ſuperconꝛpoꝛall, coulde not be bꝛought amonge them into ſuch a familiar vſe, as might leade them any nere the vnderſtandynge oꝛ beleeuynge of the veritee of the thyng, then the other woꝛds doth, noꝛ ſo nere nother, they beyng vnlearned as they are. Wherfoꝛe it were without wiſdome, all reaſon, and diſcreacion, to ſoygne ſuche woꝛdes vnto that (whiche of neceſſitee they ought to beleue) as might rather bꝛynge them in dout, and the thynge out of credence, then to confyꝛme them in their faith as the treuth thereof doth require. And therfoꝛe theſe woꝛdes naturall and coꝛpoꝛall, doth much better ſerue the purpoſe in that reſpect, then the other conid dooe amonge them, if they be well vnderſtande, and trewly conſidered, wherfoꝛe learned men doth put them there. HERE. Why, wherfoꝛe is that? CAT. Not to ſhow oꝛ

ſignifie

signifie the state or maner of the thinge, but most certeinly to confirme and ratifie the veritee therof. For the verytee of Christes blessed body in the holie sacrament is the thynge, that we are bounde to beleue, And not after what maner or sorte it is there, whiche passeth the reache of all mens wittes, but not of his power, whiche firste said the woorde, and tolde vs so muche of the matter, as is cleane out of doubte, except it be with them whiche doth therein mistrust, and not beleue him. Wherefore beside all this, if these woordes naturall and corporall, were in this case put cleane away, and not vsed of good and catholyke men, to be ioyned vnto it, as they are are, how lyke is it, that some of you, wolde sone reyse vp againe, this olde very pestilent heresye of the Manicheis, whiche said that Christe had but a phantasticall bodie, and no very body in deede. For that most wicked errour, is not convinced and put away, by any woordes, more clerely then by the woords natural and corporal. For when by them, the body is called a natural body, & of a corporal substance, that doth declare it plainly, not to be phantastical, but euen very essencial. And therfore one of the chiefe causes why catholike mē do vse to put those woords vnto it, is to preuent, & suppresse that cursed heresie, from risynge any more agayne. And an other cause is (as I saide before) to confyrme and stablishe the faith of the multitude, in the veritee of the thinge, And not to declare therby the maner of beynge and qualitees therof (whiche farre passeth our knowledge) nor to show any suche naturalitee or corporalite, to be in it, as we haue in our bodies, subiect to the order and course of nature, by reason wherof, we are now

and

and then, compelled euen to suffayne, diuers displeasures.

Cap. 35.

HER. Yet syr, how so euer other qualitees behaueth them selues in christes body, we must nedes thinke, that he hath in it, the very same proper quantitee therof, which he had when he walked here in earth. CA. What euen so, as we haue ours, or he had his then? HE. Ye how els? CAT. Then tell me this. hast thou not hard of some honest man, that without iust cause hath ben put in the stockes, yrons, or in close prisō, when he wolde haue bene away, if he might? HER. Yes that I haue. CAT. And what helde him there then againste his will? HE. Marry the stockes, yrons, or the pryson, wherin he was. CAT. It semeth so. But yet if thou consider it well, thou shalt finde it his quantitee, and nothing els. For if his quantitee had bene so subiect to his power, as his power was to his quantite, he might haue vsed his quantitee then, according to his will. For any man may vse what so euer is in his power, as he will & list him selfe. And therfore if he might haue vsed his quātitee according to his will, it was not the stockes, yrons, nor the pryson nother, that could haue holden him therin, when he wolde haue bene away. wherfore it was his quantitee (not being subiect to his power) that kept him there against his will. And therfore wilt thou thinke that christ hath the quantite of his holy body after that sorte? HER. Why syr, this must needes be trew, that of the length, bredth, and depth of it, an ynch can be none other, no more, nor lesse, then an ynche. And a foote, none other

no more nor lesse, then a foote. And the hole, none other, no more, nor lesse then the hole. Nor the least part of it, none other no lesse nor no more then the least part. And this order of quantitee holdeth (as it must nedes do) in euery mans body likewyse. CATH. Thou doest yet dreame still (I perceiue) vpon the common order of nature, and nothing els. Accordyng to the which, quantitee hath also this properte, that alway the more, must needes conteyne the lesse. And the hole all the partes thereof. But what if the quantitee of Christes blessed body be now of this sorte, that the lesse maie conteine the more. And euery part the hole? HER. That is impossible. CATH. Not so impossible, as it is for the to beleue it, so longe as thou dost thinke it impossible. But neuertheless, thou and I maie chaunce, although not now, yet hereafter, to assaie what maie be sayde to the possibilites thereof. Where as for this tyme, this may be sufficient, that Christes blessed body is now without doubt supernaturall. And therfore other it is all hole supernatural, or els but in parte. If it be supernatural but in parte, then is the rest of it, vnder the yeoke and bondage of nature still, which (I suppose) were wickednes to thinke. Wherfore of the other syde, if it be all hole supernaturall, as it is in deed, then there is no part of it, but must nedes be supernaturall likewyse. And therefore if there be no part of it, but supernatural, then must the quantitee thereof nedes be supernatural to. For that is a certaine parte of it, except thou wilt say (as I thinke thou wilt not) that it is without any quantitee at all. Wherfore if the quantitee therof be supernaturall, as it must nedes be, this maie well folow, that as the bon-

dage

dage of naturalitee in naturall bodies, compelleth the moze quantitee, to conteine the leſſe, and the hole, all the partes, ſo the liberte of ſupernaturalite in Chriſtes ſupernaturall body, doth permit and able the leſſe quantitee, to conteyne the moze, and euery parte the hole. Foz a dyfference to be betwene quantitee, naturall, and ſupernaturall, thou muſt nedes graunt. And as foz anie other difference betweene them then this, I ſuppoſe thou ſhalt not be able to fynde anye. HERE. Yes ſyz that I can. foz quantitee naturall, is of neceſſitee vyſyble, and ſo is not quantitee ſupernaturall. CATH. Although it were euen ſo as thou ſaieſt, yet that coulde make no pzoper difference betwene them. Foz althoughe ſome quantitee naturall, be of neceſſitee vyſyble, yet all is not ſo. Foz the naturall quantitee of the ayer, nother is noz can be viſible, when the hole body of the ayer it ſelfe, is inuiſible. And therefoze how ſhould viſibilitee, and inuiſibilitee make a difference betwene quantitee naturall and quantitee ſupernaturall, when bothe maie be founde in ons of them? That is to ſay, in quantitee naturall. HER. Then this maie be the dyfference betweene them. That quantitee ſupernaturall is perpetuall, and hath a beynge foz euer. But ſo hath not quantytee naturall. CATHOLICVS. Why ſaieſt thou ſo? Foz as the earth is perpetuall and ſhall haue a beynge foz euer, ſo the naturall quantitee thereof muſt nedes haue and be lykewyſe. Wherefoze perpetuitee can bee no pzoper difference betweene them nother, when it is and maie be founde in eache of them. And therefoze ſeeke as longe as thow wylt, harde

it shalbe for the (as I sayd) to fynde any other differ-
rence betwene them, then I haue showed the. Or if
there be any other, yet they let not, but this maie be
one for all that. Wherfore if this be one, that the lesse
quantitee maie conteyne the more, and euery parte,
the hole, where is your hereticall obiection become, that
ye saie so great a quantitee as Christes bodie is of, can
not be in so little a space, as the sacrament dooth occu-
pie: as who say, he can therin none otherwyse be, or do,
then ye can vnderstand.

Cap. 36.

HERE. Syr, how so euer he can be or do, or we
can vnderstande, well I wot, that so great a quan-
titee to be in so little space, is far against reason.
CATH. Then if thou wilt not be satisfied, with that I
haue saide alredy, tel me this. how are all thinges new
in him, if his quantitee be olde, that is to say, of the olde
sorte, as it was before his resurrection? For dooth not
the holy apostle, after he had sayd,
2.cor.5, Although we haue knowne Christe after the flesshe, yet we
, do not so now.
Adde vnto it and say this.
, If there be any new creature in Christe, the olde thinges
, are past and gone.
And that he confirmeth with these woordes.
, Beholde (he saith) all are made new.
HERE. Pe syr, all that he speaketh, for as muche
as perteyneth to the spirite of them, that trewly folo-
weth Christe. But not for any thynge that perteye-
neth to the flesshe. CATHOLI. Wilt thou saie so,
when

when he doeth euen there make mencion of Chriſtes fleſhe: wherefore therin, thou ſayeſt not well. For he ſpeaketh it bothe of Chriſte, for ſo muche as partayneth to the newnes of him in fleſhe, and alſo of them, that trewlie folow him, for ſo muche as pertayneth to the newneſſe of them in ſpirit. That is to ſay, in ſpirite now, and in fleſhe then, when they ſhal riſe agayne and be made all new, not only in ſpirit, but alſo in fleſhe, where as now they are all new, not in fleſhe but oneſe in ſpirit. And therfore the minde of the apoſtle is there, to declare, that as Chriſte is now all new in fleſhe, for ſo muche as partaineth to the mortal and corruptible ſtate of the quantite and qualites thereof, ſo muſt thoſe that trewly folow him, be now all new in ſpirite, that they might here after at the latter day, be likewiſe all new in fleſhe, as he is now.

Who ſhall then as the apoſtle ſayeth, tranſforme the low ſtate of theyr bodies into the likeneſſe of the glorious ſtate of his bodye, accordinge to the operation of his power, wherby he is able to make all thynges obedient vnto hys will, as it appereth to the Philippians. Cap. 3. Phili. 3.

Wherfore if thou ſay that Chriſtes holy fleſh, hath in it now, ſuche quantite, as it had before his reſurrectiō, Thou ſayeſt none other therin, but that it is olde. And therefore if thou ſay that it is olde, then thou denieſt it playne to be new. And if thou dente it to be new, then thou arte therin directly agaynſt the holy Apoſtle, whiche doeth partelie therof ſay, as before is alledged. The olde thinges are gone and paſt, beholde all are made new.

Therefore what thinges are made new in Chriſtes fleſhe, but the corruptible quantite and qualites therof:

for when he sayeth.

» Although we haue knowne christ after the flesshe, yet we » do not so now.

He doeth not therein denie him to haue flesshe, but to be knowen after the flesshe. Therefore what other thinge is it, not to know him after the flesshe, but not to knowe him after the former course and olde state of the flesshe, as it was before his resurrection, whyche is now altered, chaynged, and made new, farre after an other sorte. And therefore when the quantite and qualites of hys blessed flesshe, in the time of the passibilite, and mortalite thereof, were for all that, euen then obedient and subiecte vnto hys holy will, farre beyonde and contrarie to the common course of nature, as I declared vnto thee before, And when they are (farthermore) euen now in the tyme of hys glorification, made new, and chaynged so farre into suche an other state, as passeth the vnderstandinge of any mortall mannes witte, why dyemyst thou (not wythstandynge all thys) vpon anie suche naturalite and corporalite to be in it, as is in ours, or was in hys, before his resurrection, when (the verye trewth to say) that same naturalite, is now turned into supernaturalite, and that corporalite, into supercorporalite, yf I might so call it? Leaue therefore thy musinge and beholdinge of any course of nature in thys case, whyche course of nature hath herein nothing to do. For so longe as thou doest wey the matter after that and seekest none other rule to folow then so, it is not possible for thee to come by the trewth and to beleue therin, as thou oughtest to doo. HERE. Then syr

I pray you this, who is able by ante reason to vnderstande, how any of them bothe, that is to say, other the body or the flesshe, should or may haue ante beyng at all after thys sorte, that ye speake of? for how is it possible to vnderstande a mannes body or flesshe to be, wythout what so euer is corporall or carnall? That is to saye, wythout suche quantitee and qualites as perteyneth vnto them, by the course of nature? specialtie, when we haue no knowledge of them at all, but that it is fyrste gotten, by suche maner of thynges, as belongeth vnto them naturallie?

CATHOLICVS. I doubte not but this question troubleth thy hedde verie muche. HERE. It doeth in deede. CATH. And why? HERE. I can not tell why, but so it doeth. CATHOLI. In very deede for nothynge els, but only because thou woldest fayne vnderstande, before thou doest, or wylt beleue. But how can that be? when the Scripture sayeth.

Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis. That is to say, except ye beleue, ye shall not vnderstande.

Therefore beleue well fyrst, that thou mayst be the better able, to vnderstande at the laste. Or yf thou wylt nedes haue vnderstanding go before, let not thyne vnderstanding leaue this behinde, but take it for a suer trewth that this matter, is not committed vnto vs, to be vnderstande, but most constantly, and firmely, to be beleued. It is a matter of faythe, and not of knowledge or vnderstandinge. And therefore it is enoughe herein, that vnderstandinge is able, to refell and ouerthrow, what so euer any malitious aduersarie, is able to

imagyn

imagin or say to the contrary. And so to commit the rest vnto parfit fayth, which worketh by charite. For she is able to bringe her seruant vnderstandinge, to the very contemplation of the thinge, when the conuenient tyme thereof shalbe. HERE. And call you vnderstandinge a seruant to faythe? CATH. Ye why not? HERE. Vnderstandinge me thinke is the worthiest of the twayne. CATH. Thereof is no doubt, where it hath the higher place, but that (thou must consider) is not yet euen now in this case, nor in many other mo, nor herafter shalbe, except it folow fayth for the time, and serue her trewly, that is (with her helpe) to defende her boldely, from her great enemies, whiche seeketh her destruction dayly.

Cap. 37.

HERE. Syr with this talke I perceyue, ye wolde lede me away from my purpose cleane. CATH. Why what is that? HERE. Thynke you, that I haue yet forgotten and cleane done, with those two latter places, whiche (as I haue showed you) John Frithe dothe alledge of Saynt Austen? CATH. If thou hast not done with them in deede, I do not a litle maruell. For I suppose, thou hast harde of them so muche, that thou haste no neede of anie more. HERE. You thynke so, but so do not I. For Saynt Austen sayeth euen playnlie, that they whiche abide not in Christe, nor Christ in them, eate not his body nor his flesshe, although they eate the Sacrament of so great a thinge. Wherof (as I sayd before, and as Frithe doeth declare) this must folowe, that Christes very body and his very flesshe, is not in the Sacrament really and presently. For if it were, they

should

ſhoulde eate that, when they eate the Sacrament. CAT. And haue I not tolde thee playne enoughe, that euen ſo they do in deede? HER. Ye but Saynt Auſtens woꝛdes be as playne to the contrarie, that they do not. CATH. No, not fruitfullie, pꝛofitablie, and effectually, that is to ſay, not ſpiꝛitually. HERE. Tuſhe will ye be there? Saynt Auſten doeth make no mention of fruitfully, pꝛofitablie, effectually, noꝛ ſpiritually nother, but ſayeth abſolutly and directly that they eate it not. CATH. Althoughe he doeth ſo ſay, and expꝛeſſeth no farther, yet he meaneth it, of the only ſpirituall eatinge, and of none other. HER. All that is but your ſaying and your opinion, as mine is to the contrarie. And therfoꝛe if you can none otherwyſe pꝛoue his meaninge then ſo, I will vtterlie ſticke vnto his playne ſayinge, whiche maketh with frith clerely. CATH. What foꝛ all this, that we haue ſayde and done hytherto? HERE. Ye foꝛ all that. CAT. Then if thou wilt needes haue me trie out herein, Saynt Auſtens very meaninge, how can I better do it, then with his owne ſayinge? HERE. I muſt needes graunt, there is none to that. CATH. Syꝛſte therefoꝛe to begyn with all, when the one of thoſe places, is in Saynt Auſtens woꝛke De Ciuitate dei Libro. 21. Cap. 25. and the other noted, in Frithes booke wyth thys tytle, Auguſti. ſermo. circa ſacra feria paſche, and alſo when Frithes purpoſe in bothe places, lieth vpon the vnderſtanding of this texte of the Goſpell.

He that eateth my fleſhe and dꝛinketh my bloud, bideth in me, and I in him.

Tell me why doeth Frithe here hꝛynge in Saynt Auſten vpon the ſayde text, in thoſe foꝛeſayde places, where

it was nother Saynt Auſtens only, nor yet his principall purpoſe to ſpeake of it, but as it were by the way, tooke parte of the ſence thereof, to fortifie thereby, an other matter whyche he had in hande: why doeth Frithe (I ſay) bringe in Saynt Auſtens ſayinge vpon the ſayde text in thoſe places, & not in that place, where Saynt Auſten goeth vpon it purpoſlie, and onelie to ſhowe the vnderſtandinge thereof: is there any other why, but hys accuſtomed falſhed, yf a man wold marke it well: For who wolde paſſe ouer a mans ſaying in a matter, where he ſpeketh purpoſly & only of it, and take him in an other place, where he by chaunce toucheth it but partelie, & as the caſe and occaſion, which he hath in hande, doeth there requere: who (I ſay) wolde ſo do, and meane trewlie? HERE. Yee peraduenture thoſe wordes whiche Frithe doeth here alledge of Saynt Auſten in thoſe forſayde places, be the very ſame wordes whiche Saynt Auſten hath in that place, that ye ſpeake of. And then, yf it be ſo, it is well enoughe. CATH. That ſhall appere ſtrayght way. For that place whiche I ſpeake of, is vpon the ſixte chapiter of Saynt John. where ſaynt auſten reciting that ſame text purpoſly to declare the meaninge therof, hath theſe wordes.

» Qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum ſangui-
» nem, in me manet, & ego in illo, hoc eſt ergo mandu-
» care illam eſcam, & illum bibere potum, in Chriſto
» manere, & illum manentem in ſe habere. Ac per hoc,
» qui non manet in Chriſto, & in quo non manet
» CHRISTVS, procul dubio, nec manducat ſpiritua-
» liter carnem eius nec bibit eius Sanguinem.

That is to ſay.

He that eateth my flesshe and drinketh my bloud, bideth in me and I in him. This is therefore, to eate that meate and to drinke that drinke, to abyde in christe, and to haue christ abide in vs. And by this, he that abideth not in christe, and in whome christe abydeth not, without doubt, he eatethe not his flesshe spiritually, nor drinketh his bloud.

How sayest thou now? HER. Euen as I thought at the firste. For ye can not say, but these are (so far as they go) euen the very same wordes, whiche Saynt Austen hath in the firste of the other two places before. CATH The verie same sayest thou? HERE. The very same, all saue one worde. CATH. Ye, whiche one is that? HERE, Thys worde, spiritually. CATH. Thou sayest euen trew. And therefore that same one worde spiritually, was the verie thinge, that caused Frithe to refuse this place of Saynt Austen, and to runne to those other two places, wherein that worde spiritually was not expressed. By reason wherof, Frithe had in them some hope, where as in this, he had none at all. For he perceyuinge this place to speake precisely, and expressely of one eating that is speciall, (whiche geueth an other to be vnderstand, that is general) thought, that if he should make his allegation thereof, it wolde geue an occasion, of a great interruption of all his purpose. And therefore he toke the other two places, (which (as he thought) semed to deny the very eatinge that is generall) to serue hys turne farre better then this, whiche doeth expresse the speciall. Wherin he clerely deceyued him self, as it may well appere by this, that Saynt Austen doeth euen here, the verie same that he doeth there, speake onely, (as I sayde) of one sorte of eaters in speciall, and not of all ingenerall. Wherfore the same eatinge that S. Austen

doeth meane there, must nedes be vnderstande of thys eatinge, whiche he doeth expresse here. For indeede they be all one, as the speciall state and sorte of the eaters is, of whome he speaketh in all three places.

Cap. 38.

HERE. Then I maruel greatly, that Saint Austen wolde in these two places, so bestow his wordes and speake them, after suche a sorte as he doeth. CATH. Why doest thou maruell there at? HER. Because he doeth therin, seme rather to meane, as Frithe taketh him, then to meane as you reporte hym. CAT. To whome doeth he so seme to meane? HERE. To euerie man I thinke. CATH. That is not so, for I, and moste men, taketh him to meane therin, far otherwise then Frithe dothe. And therfore he semeth not so to vs, as he doeth to him. HERE. I can not tell how he semeth to you, but well I wot, he semeth to me and manie other mo to meane euen as Frithe dothe take hym. CATH. Ye but wotest thou why? HERE. No not yet. CATH. In very deede because Frithe and suche other as he was, were none of those, to whome Saynt Austen wrote in those two places, after that sort as he doth. HERE. To whome then? CATH. Wythout fayle vnto none, but onelie to men of good wyll, and that of the learned sorte of the Catholyke faythe. To whome Saynt Austens mynde, is in those two places, cleare ynoughe, and out of all doubte. Therfore only to them (I say) he wrote there, as he doeth, and not vnto anie such heretikes as Fryth was, whome no trewth can satysfie. For looke where so euer Saynt Austen

wrote

wrote any thynge vnto them, that is to sais vnto heretikes (because they lacke both trewth and also good will to) he left therfore no parte of his minde vnexpressed (so farre as the matter requyred, wherin he procured their amendment) but did at large, with suche plainenesse so set it foorth vnto them, that they them selues could haue no doubt of his meanynge, although they were neuer so vnwillyng to take any profyte of his playne sayynge. This he vsed alway vnto them, but not alway so vnto vs. Because in vs, there was no suche neede. For we, by his expresse and manifest speakynge of this matter in some place, do ryght well know his trew secret and sylent meanynge therof (although not expressed) in euery other place. Wherin we doo not as ye wolde do if ye myght. HERE. What is that? CATH. Ye wold hyde, and ouerthrow that, whiche is very certaine and manifest, by that, whiche seemeth vncertaine and secret. But we contrariwyse, as reason compelleth vs, do show and defend that, whiche seemeth incertaine and secret, by that, whiche is moste certaine and manifest. For where Saint Austen saith.

They that abyde not in Christe, nor Christe in them, eateth not his flesh nor drinketh his blood, although they eate and drynke the sacrament of so great a thynge.

Because he expresseth not there, euen certainely what maner of eatyng it is that he meaneth (wherefore some, are therof in doubt) we may and iustly do, way that place by this, where he saith.

He that abydeth not in Christe, and in whom Christe abydeth not, without doubt he eateth not his flesh spiritually, nor drinketh his blood.

By this place therfore, we louse the other, because he

excludyng all doubt in this, doth plainely expresse what maner of eatyng it is, that he doth meane in the other, wherein he dooth but leaue it to men of good wyll to be vnderstande, who neuer faileth to take it ryght. Therefore when that maner of eatynge, whyche he dooth meane, is made very certaine in the one place and not so in the other. That is to say, plainely expressed in the one place, and not expressed in the other, why dyd Fryth alledge him in that place, where it is not expressed (sith in that maner of eatynge lyeth all the matter) and wolde not alledge him in the other place, where it is expressed, and put cleane out of question? what other why (as I sayde before) can there be found in his so doinge, but onely falshed? For who woulde take a mannes tale to witnesse, where he speaketh but obscurely or incerteinly, and vtterly refuse it there, where he speaketh it full, hole, and plainly? any man els, but onely Frithe, and such as he was? for the plaine place he wist well, he could nother ouerthrow, nor yet wrynge it to anye apparence of his purpose. But the obscure and ambiguous place, he thought he might wrest, whiche waie he liste, and so to make many beleue (as he did in deede) that it sufficientlye serued his turne. HERE. Yet ye confesse that place of Saint Austen whiche Frythe dooth alledge, to be obscure and ambiguous. CATH. Ye to them, that lacketh good wyll or knowladge. But not to them, (as I sayde) whiche be learned and of the catholyke fayth. Wherefore, thus maiest thou see, why Frith alledged that place of Saint Austen and not this, so crastylie as he dyd. Whiche was no more but one-

ly because, when he saw, there was made therein, no spectall mention by name of the reall eatynge, whiche is moste common and generall, nor yet of the spyrytuall eatynge, whiche is more singuler and specyall, but of eatynge symplie, without anie dyrecte or proper distinction, he thought he myght vnderstande of them bothe, whiche he lyst, or els take it, as thoughe there had bene none other maner of eatynge thereof, but euen veris one alone. And thereuppon he did take that place to be no lesse, then enoughe, and very sufficient to proue his purpose. As I graunt it had beene in deede, if it had beene after that sorte to be vnderstande, as he tooke it. But he looked so muche vpon this poynte, that he founde there no mention made of anie dystynction of eatynges (whereby he thought he myght take (as I sayde) whyche he lyste or one for all) that he forgat, what mention Saynt Austen made there, of the distynctyon (although not of eatynges, yet for all that) of eaters, whiche was enoughe, to show what maner of eatynge he mente. For as his manifest speakynge was there, of a peculiar sorte of eaters, so his very meanynge, muste needes be vnderstande of a peculiar maner a eatynge.

For it is agaynst all reason and trewthe, to denye that to some, whiche is common to all, or to graunte that to all, which perteyneth but to some. And therfore, thou maist well know, that Saint Austen wolde not do so. For he denyed not there, but onely that eatynge, whiche apperteyneth vnto some, and not vnto all.

That

That is to say, only to them that be good, and not vnto them that be nought. Of whom there, he dooth make mention, and of none other. For the libertee real of eating perteyneth both to good and bad. But the spirituall eatyng perteyneth to none but onely to them that be good.

Cap. 39.

HERE. Sir, Saint Austen maketh no suche distinction or difference betwene reall and spiritual eatyng, nor betwene generall and spectiall eating as ye speake of. CATH. Why saiest thou so? for, although he doth it not, euen in those maner of wordes, with suche conference of both together as thou woldest haue yet he doth it in deede for all that. as it doth right well appere vpon the syrt of Saint Iohn, Tracta. 27. where his wordes be these.

„Hoc totum quod dominus de carne & de sanguine „suo loquutus est. Et quod in eius distributionis gra„tia vitam nobis promisit æternam. Et quod hinc vol„uit intelligi manducatores carnis & sanguinis sui vt „in illo maneant, & ipse in illis. Et quod non intellex„erunt, qui non crediderunt. Et quod spiritualia car„naliter sapiendo, scandalizati sunt. Et quod eis scan„dalizatis, & pereuntibus, consolatio domini affuit „discipulis qui remanserant, ad quos probandos inter„rogauit, Nunquid & vos vultis ire, vt responsio per„manionis eorum innotesceret & nobis, nam & ille no„uerat qui manebant. Hoc ergo totum, ad hoc nobis „valet DILECTISSIMI, vt carnem Christi & „sanguinem Christi, non edamus tantum in sacramen„to, quod & multi mali, sed vsq; ad spiritus perticipa-

tionem

rionem manducemus & bibamus. Vt in domini corpore tanquam membra maneamus, vt eius ſpiritu vegetemur, & non ſcandalizemur, etiamſi multi modo nobiſcum manducant & bibunt temporaliter ſacramenta, qui habebunt in fine æterna tormenta.

That is to ſay.

All this that our lorde ſpake, of his fleſhe and his blood, And that in the grace of diſtribucion therof, he promiſed vnto vs lyfe euerlaſtynge, and that therof he wolde to be vnderſtande, that the eaters and drinkers of his fleſhe and blood, ſhould abyde in him and he in them, And that they did not vnderſtande, whiche did not beleue, And that they were offended, by vnderſtandynge ſpirituall thinges carnally, And that they beyng offended and perylſhynge, the comforte of our lorde was preſent to the diſciples which did abide, vnto the probacion of whom he aſked, wil you go away, that the anſwere of their abiding might be alſo knowen to vs, for he knew them whiche did abide. All this therefore, moſt deerely beloued, auayleth vnto vs for this purpoſe, that we ſhoulde not eate the fleſhe of Chriſte and the blood of Chriſte onely in the ſacramente, (whiche many doth that be nought) but that we ſhoulde eate and drynke it, vnto the part taking of the ſpirite, that wee ſhoulde abyde as membres in the body of our Lorde, that we might be quickned with his ſpirite, And that we ſhould not be offended, although many now, dooth eate and drynke the ſacramentes with vs temporally, whiche ſhall haue in thende tormentes eternall.

Now what canſt thou wiſhe more plainely ſpoken, for the reall eatynge and drynkynge of Chriſtes moſt precious fleſhe and blood in the holy ſacramente, then when he ſayth (as here thou ſeeſt) we eate it not onely in the ſacrament: that ſame not onely in the ſacramente, dooth moſte cleerely declare it to be therin euen verely eaten. for he wolde not haue ſaid,

not onely in the sacrament, but not in the sacrament. For not in the sacrament, and not onely in the sacrament, are two thinges. Not in the sacrament, denyeth it to bee eaten therein, but not onely in the sacrament, confesseth it to bee eaten therein, and also other wise to. Wherefore this very reall eatinge of Christes blessed flesh and blood in the holy sacrament, must nedes be common and generall, when (as here S. Austen saith) many doth it, which be nought, whose eating therof, thou maiest well know commeth not to the participation or partaking of the spirite that quickneth, when those be they, that abyde not in Christe, nor Christe in them. And therefore the participation or partakynge of the spirite therin, is and must needes be, the spirituall eatynge, whiche is not generall, but speciall and proper onely to those, that abyde in Christ, and Christ in them. as the noughty and euill sorte dooth not. And yet they in the sacrament (as Saint Austen doth here plainly say) do eate his flesshe, and that must nedes be really, because it is to playne, that it can not be spiritually. Wherfore, here thou hast now of Saint Austen plainely expressed, and distinctlie touched, both the very reall eating, which is common to good and bad, and also the spirituall eatyng, whiche pertayneth to none, but onely to them that be good. HARE. Yet this place of Saint Austen, although ye make the most of it that ye can, neuertheless it doth not so well satisfie me, as you thinke. CAT. In that thou shewest of what sorte thou arte, And therfore here him in an other place, where his woordes be these.

Illud etiam qnod ait. Qui manducat carnem meam & bibit sanguinem meum in me manet & ego in illo.

Sermo 11. de

&

Quomodo intellecturi sumus? Nunquid etiam illos hic poterimus accipere, de quibus dicit Apostolus, quod iudicium sibi manducent & bibant, cum ipsam carnem manducent & ipsum sanguinem bibant? Nnnquid & Iudas magistri venditor & traditor ipsius, quamuis primum ipsum manibus eius confectum Sacramentum carnis & sanguinis eius cum cæteris discipulis, sicut apertius LVCAS EVANGELISTA declarat, manducaret & biberet, mansit in Christo, aut Christus in eo? Multi denique qui vel corde ficto carnem illam manducant & sanguinem bibunt, vel cum manducauerint & biberint Apostatæ fiunt, nunquid manent in Christo, aut Christus in eis? Sed profecto est quidam modus manducandi illam carnem & bibendi illum sanguinem: quo modo, qui manducauerit & biberit, in Christo manet & Christus in eo. Non ergo qnocunque modo quisquam manducauerit carnem Christi & biberit sanguinem Christi, manet in Christo, & in illo Christus. Sed certo quodam modo, quem modum vtique ipse videbat, quãdo ista dicebat. verbis domini

which may thus be englished. How shall we vnderstande this whiche he saith, he that eateth my flesshe, and drinketh my blood, bydeth in me, & I in him? may we take those to be vnderstande here, of whom thapostls doth say, that thei eate & drinke their own damnacion, when they eate the same flesshe, and drinke the same blood? Also did Iudas the wicked traytour and seller of his maister, although he did (as Luke the Euangelist dooth apertlie declare) eate and drynke with the other disciples the same sacrament of his flesshe and blood when it was first made in his owne hands, abide in christ and christe in him? farthermore, there be many, that euen with a feigned hart, do eate that flesshe and drinke that blood, or when they haue eate and drinke it, forsake

» ther kayth, abyde they in Chriſte, and Chriſte in them?
» but in very deede ther is a certayne maner of eatyng that
» fleſhe and drynkynge that blood, whereby, he that eateth
» it and drynketh it, abydeth in Chryſte and Chriſte in him.
» Therfore not in what ſo euer maner, anye man eateth
» the fleſhe of Chriſte, and drinketh the blood of Chriſte, a-
» bideth in chriſte, and chriſte in him. But in a certaine ma-
» ner which maner he ſaw, when he ſpake theſe woordes.

If thou be not here now euen thorowly ſatiſfyed, both as touching the certeintee and alſo the difference, of theſe two eatings and drinkings of Chriſts moſt bleſſed fleſhe and blood, that is to ſay, both of the reall eating, and alſo of the ſpirituall eating of it, it is not Saint Auſten, nor all the other holy fathers beſyde, that therein can ſatiſfy the. For no man can more plainly expreſſe them, then he doth here diſtinctly denyde and ſhow them.

Cap. 40.

HER. Ye but ſir, Frith by al thoſe woordes of eating and drinking of Chriſts owne very fleſhe and blood, doth vnderſtand none other meaning therof but only ſpirituall eating and drinking of it in faith, and not very reall eatyng and drinkynge of it in deede, but after ſuch a ſorte as he meaneth and ſpeaketh of, in the fourth leafe of his booke, where his woordes be theſe.

» Abraham (he ſaith) did eate his body and drynke his blood
» thorow faith.

And in the firſt leafe he ſaith alſo

» It was not neceſſarie, that the woordes ſhould ſo be vn-
» derſtand as they ſound.

That is to ſay, he wold not haue it ſo taken, that theſe woords of eating & drinking, ſhould, as they ſound, be vnderſtand of the very reall eating and drinking of chriſtes

owne

owne flesshe and bloud in deede, but only of the fayth and beleuing in him, as it appereth in the .17. lefe of his boke where he fayth.

Who so euer dwelleth in Chriſte, (that is to fay) beleueth, that he is ſent of god to ſaue vs from our ſinnes) doeth verelie eate and drinke his body and bloud, althoughe he neuer receyue the ſacrament. This (ſayeth he) is the ſpiritual, eating neceſſarie for all that ſhalbe ſaued.

And in the .47. leafe.

As for, our fayth (he ſayth) it nedeth not to haue him preſent in the breade. For I may (ſayeth he) as well eate hym, and drinke hym thorow fayth, that is to fay, beleue in him, as thoughe he were as preſentlie in the Sacrament as he was hanginge on the croſſe.

Now therfore by this, you may perceyue that Frithe (as I ſayde) doeth vnderſtande none other by all thoſe wordes of eatinge and drinking of that flesshe and bloud, but only ſpirituall eatinge and drinkinge of it in fayth. That is to fay, onelie beleuing without any reall eating of it at all. CATH. What, in ſo many places, and ſo diuerſly, as our Sauiour Chriſte him ſelfe, his holy apoſtles, and al the other holy fathers of the Catholike churche, doeth ſpeake of it, in thoſe playne wordes of eatinge and drinkinge? And when none of them all, doeth ſo declare it, nor teache it? as in witneſſe whereof, it dothe in the wordes of S. Auſten, laſt recited befoze, very clerely appere, if thou remember them well. When therein he ſayeth, that thoſe doeth eate the ſame flesshe and drinke the ſame bloud, of whome the holy Apoſtle doeth ſaye, they eate it and drinke it, to theyr dampnation. And playne it is that thoſe, whiche eate it and drinke it to theyr dampnation, doeth nother eate it, nor drinke it ſpiritually. For yf they did, it coulde not be to their damp

nation, But to theyr saluatiō. Wherfore how so euer Frī they doeth take it, sithe it is cleare by Saynt Austen, that those, which doth eate it & drink it to their dampnation, doth eate the same flesh and drinke the same bloud, and yet not spiritually, it must therefore needes folow, that they do eate it & drinke it euen in very deede really. Except thou wylt say, they eats it not at all, whiche were directly agaynst Saynt Austen and Saynt Paule bothe.

Farthermore, thou shalt vnderstande, that in Saynt Austens dayes, there were many, that came and dyd beleue in the name of Christe, whiche were called Cathecumini, that is to say, herers or learners. And so called because they were not baptised, for that they beleued not some certayn mysteries in some of the Sacramentes. And therfore where the gospell doeth say, that when Christ was at Jerusalem in the tyme of Easter, many did beleue in the name of hym, for the myracles they
Iohn. 2. saw him do, but Jesus did not commit hym selfe vnto them.

Saynt Austen vpon the same place doth say, that all those be suche, whiche are called cathecumini, that is to say, herers or learners. For his owne wordes thereof in latin be these.

» Tales sūt oēs Cathecumini. Ipsi iā credunt in nomine
» Christi Sed Iesus non se credit eis. Intendat & intelli-
» gat charitas vestra. Si dixerimus cathecumino, credis
» in Christo? Respondet, credo, et signat se. Iam crucem
» christi portet in fronte. Et non erubescit in cruce do-
» mini sui. Ecce credit in nomine eius. Interrogamus
» eum, manducas carnem filii hominis & bibis sanguinē
» filii hominis? Nescit quid dicimus, quia Iesus non se

credit

credit ei.

Which may thus be englished.

Cathecumini are al of the same sort. For they beleue in the name of christ. But Jesus cõmitteth not him self vnto thẽ. Let your charite marke and vnderstande. If we shall say to the cathecumini, doest thou beleue in Chryste? he wyll answer and say, I beleue, and blesseth him self. Now he beareth the crosse of Chryst in hys forehead. And is not ashamed of the crosse of hys lorde. Beholde, he beleueth in hys name. We aske hym agayn, doest thou eate the flesh of the sonne of man, and drinke the bloud of the sonne of man? he knoweth not what we say, because Jesus hathe not committed hym selfe vnto hym.

Now sayest thou now? what thinge is it, whiche thys Cathecuminus doeth here not know, when he is asked this playne question of the eating and drinking of Chrystes most blessed flesche and bloud? The wordes be playn. And therefore what is there in them, that (as Saynt Austen saieth of him) he doeth not know? HER. The spirituall vnderstanding of it? CATH. What meanest thou by the spirituall vnderstandinge of it? HERE. The spyrituall eatinge and drinkinge of that flesh and bloud. CATH. Be but what is the spirituall eatinge and drinkinge therof? HERE. It is, as Frithe hath sayd to beleue in Chryste. CATH. To beleue in Chryste: is it that thinkest thou, whiche Saynt Austen doeth here meane, that (as he sayeth) this Cathecuminus doeth not know, when he hym selfe sayth of him, that he beleueth in christe? Thou mayst perceyue it can not be so. For yf S. Austen had ment here none other eatinge and drinkynge of it but that, he wolde not haue noted him to be ignorant of his question, when he him selfe reporteth

him

him to beleue in the name of Chriſte. For that were as muche as he requireth, if he had ment nothinge els. Therfore if thou perceyue it not alredy, let vs looke farther what S. Auſten doeth meane, by hys not knowinge. Anie thinge els, but his not beleuinge? And what meaneth Saynt Auſten by his not beleuing, but that he beleueth not accordinge to his aſkyng? And what is it to beleue accordinge to his aſkinge, but to beleue the very eatinge and drinkinge of Chriſtes fleſhe and bloud? for that is the verie playne queſtion, whiche he doeth aſke him. Wherfore that muſt needes be the thinge which the Cathecuminus knoweth not. And that becauſe, he beleueth it not. And therfore it is hys lacke of faithe in the reall eatinge and drinkinge of Chriſtes holy fleſhe and bloud, that Saynt Auſten doeth here finde faute wyth him for. And not for anie other eatinge and drinkinge therof, which as Frithe ſayeth is nothinge els but onely faythe and beleue in Chriſt. Whiche fayth (as Saynt Auſten ſayeth) this Cathecuminus hath, and yet chriſt committeth not him ſelfe vnto hym. Therefore when Saynt Auſten doeth aſke him the queſtion of eatinge and drynkinge of the fleſhe and bloud of the ſonne of man, it is an other eatinge and drinking that he doeth meane and ſpeake of, then this Cathecuminus doeth knowe or beleue, or els he wolde not reprehende hym therein as he doeth. It is an other alſo, then Frith doeth beleue, when he ſayeth a man may vſe it, although he neuer receyue the Sacrament. And therfore what other is it, but euen only the very reall eatinge and drinking of it in the holy Sacrament?

Cap.

Cap. 41.

HERE. Why syr, doeth not Saynt Austen say as Frithe doeth alledge, in the. 17, leafe of hys booke Why preparest thou teethe and belly? beleue and thou hast eaten.

CATH. What of that? wilt thou gather thereof, that there is none other eating of it, but only beleue? Therefore if there be an other, what doeth this make for Frythes purpose or thine other? And that there is an other, haue I not proued it all reddie before, by the manifest wordes of Saynt Austen hym selfe? Wherefore if thys be trew, (as Frithe doeth say it is) that these wordes of eatinge and drinking in this matter, meane nothing els but faythe and beleefe, it must needes folow, that Saynt Austen doeth here vniustlye reprehende this Cathecuminus, of whome he doeth confesse no lesse hym selfe, but that he hath faith and beleueth in the name of christ. And beside that, this must also folow thereof likewyse, that when he sayeth.

Beleue and thou hast eaten.

It is no more, nor none other to say, but beleue and thou hast beleued. What reason is this? or who wolde thinke S. Austen to meane so? HER. Why what should he there, meane els? CATH. Euen as he dothe, which is this. Beleue trewly, and thou hast eaten spiritually. For the spiritual eating, commeth not to passe, but thorow the whole trewth of beleuing. And the hoole trewth of beleuinge, consisteth not in holding some partes of the fayth, and denyinge some other, but in holdinge them whole, euen altogether. Therefore Saynt austen

doeth here (as in many other places moe) farther meane then he doeth expresse. For where he doeth here (as touching the fayth) no farther say, but beleue, yet he meaneth these wordes, wholy, and trewly, to be vnderstande with all. For he meaneth no suche beleue, as is mixed or corrupted with any falshed, or with the lacke of any parte of it. Therefore beside thys, he meaneth farther then so to. For he meaneth not that same beleefe nother, althonghe it be neuer so whole and trew whiche is infected with euyll and wycked maners. But he meaneth that, whiche (as the Apostle doeth say) worketh by charite. Wherefore beleue so, and I wyll graunte, that thou hast eaten, or els not. For withoute that maner of beleuynge (whiche is but accordinge to Saynt Austens meaninge) doubtles there can be no spirituall eatinge at all. And in that maner of beleuinge, there is and must needes be contayned, the verye beleefe of the reall eatinge. For the spyrytuall eatinge was not ordeyned for the reall eatynge, but the reall eatynge for the spirituall eatynge. And therfore withoute the very beleefe of the reall eatinge, the spirituall eatynge can neuer be had. HERE. Then the spirituall eatinge, and the reall eatynge must needes go so together, that the one can not be wythout the other. CATHOLICVS. That is not trew, excepte it be in beleefe. For therein they must needes go alway together. But els, so muche they dyffer, and are some tyme a sonder, that an infidele may chaunce to eate it really, but yet for lacke of faythe, neuer spiritually. And a good Christen man may eate it spiritually, althoughe, thorow some lawfull impediment, he eate it not real-

lie

lie. Wherefore by thys it is cleare, that all the sort of you, whyche denieth it (as Frithe doeth) to be eaten really, without doubt do neuer eate it spiritually. Wher in your tortuous and cluisshe doctrine, doeth most manifestly appere. For ye holde wyth that, whiche ye neuer do. And vtterly deny that, whiche ye dayly do. HERE. How so? CATH. Ye graunt and holde with the spirituall eatinge of Christes holy flesshe, which eatinge without fayle, ye neuer come to. And ye stifly deny the reall eatinge of it, which eatinge in deede ye often and commonly do. And therfore when ye do that, whiche your selues denie, how is it done, but vnworthyly? and wherto tendeth that, but (as the Apostle sayeth) to your owne dampnation? but now I let that passe, and to an other place of Saynt Austen, where hys owne wordes be these. 1.cor.11.

Sicut audiuimus, cum sanctum euangelium legeretur, dominus Iesus Christus exortatus est promissione vitæ æternæ ad manducandam carnem suam & bibendum sanguinem suum. Qui audistis hæc, non dum omnes intellexistis. Qui enim baptizati & fideles, estis, quid dixerit nostis. Qui autem inter vos adhuc, Cathecumini vel audientes vocantur, potuerunt esse, cum legeretur audientes, nunquid & intelligentes? Ergo sermo noster ad vtrosq; dirigitur. Qui iam, manducant carnem domini & bibunt sanguinem, eius, cogitent quid manducent, & quid bibant, ne (sicut Apostolus dixit) Iuditium sibi manducent & bibant. Qui autem non dum manducant & non dum bibunt, ad tales epulas inuitati festinent. Per istos dies magistratus, August sermo. 46. de verbis. domini

» paſcunt. Chriſtus quotidie paſcit, menſa ipſius eſt
» illa in medio conſtituta. Quid cauſæ eſt O audi-
» entes, vt menſam videatis, & ad epulas non accedā-
» tis? Et forte modo cum euangelium legeretur
» dixiſtis in cordibus veſtris, putamus quid eſt quod di-
» cit, Caro mea vere eſca eſt, & ſanguis meus vere po-
» tus eſt? Quomodo manducatur caro domini & bi-
» bitur ſanguis domini? Putamus quid dicit? Quis
» contra te clauſit vt hoc neſcias? Velatum eſt.
» Sed ſi volueris, erit reuelatum. Accede ad profeſſio-
» nem & ſoluiſti quæſtionem. Quid enim dixerit do-
» minus IESVS, iam fideles nouerunt. Tu autem Ca-
» thecuminus diceris, Audiens & ſurdus es. Aures enim
» corporis patentes habes, quia verba quæ dicta ſunt au
» dis. Sed aures cordis adhuc clauſas habes, quia quod
» dictum eſt non intelligis.

Whiche may thus be Engliſhed.

» When the holy goſpell was red as wee haue herde, our
» Lorde Jeſus erhorted vs to the eatinge of his fleſhe and
» drinkinge of hys bloud, with the promyſe of euerlaſting
» lyfe. You, whyche haue hearde theſe thynges, do
» not yet all, vnderſtande them. For you whiche are
» baptized and are faythfull, doeth knowe what he ſayde.
» But thoſe amonge you, whiche are yet called Cathecu-
» mini or hearers, may be hearers, but therein vnder-
» ſtanders thynke you? Therefore our ſermon is direc-
» ted vnto bothe. Nowe thoſe whyche doeth eate
» the fleſhe of our Lorde and drynke hys bloud, lette
» them take heede, what they eate, and what they
» drynke, leaſte (as the Apoſtle ſayeth) they eate and
» drinke it to their owne dampnation. But let them,
» whiche doeth not yet eate, nor yet drynke, beynge in-
» uited, make haſte vnto ſuche dayntes. For in theſe
» dayes magiſtrates doeth eate. Chryſt doeth dayly feede.

That

That table of his. is set in the middes. What is the cause, ye herers, that ye see the table, and come not to the delicates? perchaunce now, when the gospell was redde, you sayde in your hartes, perceiue wee what it is that he saith, my flesshe is verely meate, and my blood is verily drynke: how is the flesshe of the lorde eaten, and the blood of the lorde dronken? perceiue we what he saith? who hath hid it from the, that thou knowest it not? hid it is. But if thou wilt, it shall be opened. Come to the profession, and thou hast solued the question. For those that be now faithfull, knowth what our lord Jesus sayd. But thou art called an herer, and yet in heryng thou arte deafe. For thou hast the eares of the body open, because thou herest the woordes whiche are spoken. But thou hast the eares of the hart yet shut, because thou vnderstandest not that, whiche is said.

Now, meaneth Saint Austen here nothyng els by all these playne woords of eatyng and drynkyng of Christes holy flesshe and blood, but onely faith and beleefe: which only Frith doth call the spirituall eatyng and drynking thereof, saiyng there is none other but that: Therfore is it onely that eatyng and drinkyng, whereunto Saint Austen doth here inuite those, which he calleth Cathecumini or heres, who hath feith (as he sayd before) and doth beleue in the name of Christe all ready, and beareth his crosse in their foreheades: is it also that eatyng and drynkyng, that is to say, onely faith and beleefe, Wherevnto he doth here inuite them, with the name and promise of deinties and delicates, set vpon the table: the name of the table deintes or delicates, pretendeth & declareth an other maner of eatynge and drynkynge then is onely feith and beleefe, if thou loke well vpon it: moreouer, is only faith and beleefe, that same eating and drinking, which (as he saith) our sauiour Christe doth exhort

vs vnto, with the promise of euerlastyng lyfe: when the Cathecuminus (as he doth also declare (hath faith and doth beleue in the name of Christ, and yet commeth not to this eating and drinking, that Saint Austen speaketh of. Is it not also that eating and drinking, that is to say, only faith and beleke, wherof he saith, let them whiche doth eate the flesche of our lord, and drinke his blood take hede what they eate & what they drinke, lest (as thapostle saith) they eate it and drinke it to their own damnacion: He saith not how they eate & how they drinke, but what they eate & what they drinke. And what meaneth he by that same what: very bread in a bare signification as Frith doth take it: did not those Cathecumini or herers take it so, whom S. Austen doth reprehēd: wherfore did he blame them: but because they beleued therin to be no thing els but only that, wherin they were deceiued to: How be it, after Frithes vnderstandyng, it is all one to say, let them take hede what they eate, and what they drynke, and to say, let them take hede what they beleue and what they thynke. I will not deny, but those warnings be very good, but yet to say they be both one (as Frith doth take them) who wold vnderstande it so, but only he, and the blind westward schole which thou art of:

Cap. 42.

HERRE: Sir ye maie say what ye will. But neuertheless, all these woordes of eatyng and drinkyng are not ment litterally, but of the eatynge & drynking of the sacrament, in the only respect of it selfe, & not in the respect of christs owne very flesh and blood, which Frith saith is not there in it in deede. CATH.

Then

Then sith thou wilt be so soliche as to take it after that sort, tell me what the Sacrament is? HER. As Frith dooth say, a figure, token, or signe of Christes body and blood, representyng his deth. CATH. And is there no more in it but that? HER. No. CATH. Then why is it damnable to eate it unworthyly? HER. Because it is (as I sayd) a figure, token, or signe of Christs body and blood representynge his death. CATH. Ye but then, why is the sentence of damnation declared upon the unworthy eatynge and drynkynge of it, more then upon the unworthy lookyng or beholding of it? HER. Because Paule saith it is so. CATH. May Saint Paule dooth not say, that the one is any more damnable then the other. For he speaketh but of the one alone. And yet therin, his satynge dooth not make it damnable nother. For it dooth but declare it so to bee And therefore I aske of the, why the other shoulde not be so to? For if I be unworthy to eate it, I am (without question) unworthy to looke upon it. For betwene the acte of eatynge, and the acte of lookynge or beholdynge, doubtlesse there is no difference, of any worthynesse or unworthynesse, more in the one, then in the other. Wherefore, if there be none other cause, why it is damnable to eate it unworthyly, but because it is a fygure, token or signe of Christes boddy and blood representynge his death, then it must needes be as damnable to looke upon it, or beholde it unworthyly, because figures, tokens, and sygnes perteyne rather, and more commonlie to the sence of the sight, then to anye eatynge or drynkynge other. And therefore

fore vnwoorthy seyng or beholdyng of it, can be no lesse faute, then is the vnwoorthy eatynge and drynkynge of it, if there be no more in it, then thou speakest of. Wherfore, let vs go farther and consider this, that if it be nothynge els, but a figure, token, or sygne of Christes body and blood representynge his death, why is the sentence of damnacion declared vpon the vnworthy eatyng and drynkynge of that, more then vpon the vnwoorthy lookinge and beholdyng of the Crucifix or the roode? For that is a fygure, token, or signe of Christes boddy and blood representynge his death to. whiche it doth much more aptly, muche more apparantly, much more lyuely, and therefore muche more profitablie, then the sacramente dooth, if there bee no more in the sacrament, then thou saist there is. For that the roode doth, it doth it most sensiblie. But that the sacrament doth, it doth it scāt intelligibly. And therfore if there be no more in the sacrament, then is in the roode then is the roode as good and better then the sacrament is. HERE. No sir not so. For I will not deny, but the sacramente hath in it, that the roode hath not. CATH. What is that? HERE. The sacrament hath in it, the ordynance of Christe. And the roode, but the ordinaunce of man. For Christe did institute and ordeine the one, and man the other. CATH. Then thou muste needes graunte that therein, the ordinaunce of man, is better then the ordinaunce of Christe. For euery figure, token, or signe, is alway ordeyned to signifie. And that signe must needes be best, whiche doth most aptly and moste manifestly represent the thinge that it signifieth. But the roode doth much more manifestly represent the thing

that

that it signifieth, then the sacrament dooth, wherefore the roode muste needes bee a better signe then the sacramente is. Therefore if the roode bee (as it seemeth by Frith) a better signe then the sacrament is, And the better signe must needes procede of the better ordinance, (as the better effect, of the better cause) it foloweth plaine, that the ordinance of man in the roode is better then the ordinance of Christe in the sacrament.

HERE. Nay the sir, I can not away with that reason.

CATH. That is because thou art not able to avoide it, as thou art not in dede, except thou graunt a better thing to be in the sacrament, then any figure, token, or signe other. And a better there is none, but onely the verye thinge, that is thereby signified, which is the very body and blood of Christe. For what can be directly better then a signe in that kinde of thinges, but onely that, whiche it dooth signifie? because there is no meane betweene them, whereof any comparison is to be made, but onely of the one to the other, that is to saye, betweene them two. Therefore other thou must needes graunt the blessed body and blood of Christe to bee verely and really in the sacrament, (whereby the sacrament is made more and better, then is anye other fygure, token, or signe) or els thou must needes graunt the roode to be a better figure token or signe then the sacrament is. And so the ordinaunce of man to be better (as I sayd) in the one, then the ordinaunce of Christe in the other. Wherefore by this, (whiche thou darest not graunt) thou maist, if thou haue any grace, well perceiue the very cause why the sacramente dooth in the Judgement of all trew christen people, so farre passe

the roode as it dooth. For although the roode be a worthy sygne and very expedient for vs to behoulde, yet it is not ordeyned but onely to refreshe our memorie, fayth and deuocion. Where as the vertue of the sacrament is, to geue lyfe, helth, and saluacion. Whereof the glorious author him selfe doth saie,

Iohñ.6. Take, eate, this is my body, whiche shall be geuen for
, you. He that eateth my flesshe and drinketh my blood
, hath lyfe euerlastynge, and I wyll reyse him vp a-
, gayne in the latter daie, for my flesshe is verely meate,
, and my blood is verely drynke.

And why dooth he say, it is verely meate and verely drynke, but because we shoulde verely eate it, and verely drynke it? For what so euer is verely meate, is without doubt, to be verely eaten accordingly. And therfore what can bee spoken more literally, as touchynge the verytee of the thynge? Wherefore it was a very madde and a weyward phansie of Fryth to saye, or thynke, that there is none other meanynge or vnderstandynge of those plaine woordes of eatynge and drynkynge of that holye flesshe and blood, but onely feyth and beleefe. And that (as I sayde) in so many sondrye places, and by suche, and so many notable, and moste woorthy authors, as thát matter is spoken of, sette foorth, and by those woordes expressed. But yet euen suche is the blyndnesse of heresie, vnto the whiche, because credible seemeth incredible, and intelligible not intelligible, what skilleth it, what Fryth dooth saye? or what is his saiynge to that thou hast herde of Saint Austen? whom although he taketh aboue all men for his defence, yet thou maiest now see, how clere-

ly

ly he maketh against him. In so much, that if I should recite vnto the, all suche other places of Saint Austen as maketh no lesse, but rather more against him lykewyse, the whole daie were to little to serue the purpose. And therefore now content thy selfe with that I haue hytherto sayde, as thou hast herde alreadye, whiche is so muche, as perchaunce woulde seeme to some, euen to be more then enough. Wherefore with this content thy selfe, and fare well for this tyme.

Cap. 43.

HERE. What will ye doue syr? wyll ye now departe, without any farther examinacion of so large a matter, as Frith hath gathered together, out of all the other holy doctours besyde? CATH. Ye why not? for it were but a lost labour to bestowe anye more tyme about that, sith he bringeth none of them al, for any other purpose (as I sayd at the first) but onelie to confyrme that, which he wolde make vs to beleue, he gathereth out of Saint Austen. And that appeareth by his owne woordes, whiche I recyted vnto the before, and also will now agayne, to put the in better remembraunce thereof. For his woordes be these.

This (saith he) were proofe enough, to conclude, that all the olde fathers did holde the same opinion. For, who woulde once surmise (seynge we haue Saynt Austen so playne for vs, whiche is the chiefest among them all) who wolde once surmise (I say) that he dissented, in this great matter, from the other faythfull fathers, or they from him? Neuertheless I dare not let him stande post alone, least ye dispyse hym.

» And therefore I will showe you the minde of certaine o-
» ther also. And first of his maister Saint Ambrose.

HERE. Ye marry sir, I pray you let vs here what Saynt Ambrose saith. CATH. What neede that? For thou seest it playne, that he bringeth not in Saint Ambrose nor ante other beside for any thynge els, but onely to show thagrement betwene Saint Austen and them. And therefore looke (as I haue declared vnto the) how Saynt Austen dooth make for his purpose, euen so dooth Saint Ambrose, and all the reste lykewise. That is to saie, none otherwyse in deede, but euen dyrectlie agaynste him. HERE. Yet if ye will not recite those woordes of Saynt Ambrose, whiche Frith dooth alledge, I will recyte them my selfe.

CATH. What nede that, when thou knowest them wel enough alreadie, or els how couldest thou recite the? HER. Yet I will do it, to here what ye will say to them.

CATH. Although I haue therein sayde enoughe alreadye. Yet chose the do as thou wilt. HERE. Then ye shall vnderstande, that his allegacion of Saint Ambrose is euen this.

» Saint ambrose (saith he) writyng vpon the epistle of paule
» to the Corinthians in the .xi. chapiter saith.

„ Quia enim morte domini liberati sumus, huius rei
„ in edendo & potando carnem & sanguinem quæ pro
„ nobis oblata sunt significamus,

That is to saie.

„ Because we be deliuered by the death of the lorde, in ea-
„ tynge and drynkinge this thing meaning the sacrament,
„ we signifie the flesh and blood whiche were offerered
„ for vs.

Here

Here doeth saynt Ambrose say enough (sayth he) yf men were not sophisters, but wolde be content with reason.

Now by thys ye see, that Frithe desireth none other, but that reason might rule, as it ought to do. CAT. In deede this reason I finde in it, that thy recitall herof (as I now perceyue) chaunceth very well for thee, if thou wilt be so happy, as not to truste falshed wilfully. For if euer thou foundest a falser harlot, then Frithe shalbe founde in this, truste me no more. And that not only in his allegation of Saynt Ambrose wordes, but also in his translating of them into englyshe to. And to thyntent it may the more playnlie appere vnto thee, I wyl so trewlie alledge the very same place of Saynt Ambrose my selfe, as thou shalt not fayle to finde it, worde by worde, looke where it is, when thou wilt. For the very wordes of Saynt Ambrose are these.

Quia enim morte domini liberati sumus, huius rei membres, in edendo & potando carnem et sanguinem quæ pro nobis oblata sunt significamus.

That is to say.

Because we be deliuered by the death of our lord, we mind full therof do in eating and drinkinge the flesh and bloud, whiche were offred for vs, signifie.

HERE. Se what do we signifie? CATH. Softe let that alone for a whyle. And let vs fyrst conferre Frithes allegation and mine, not only in latin but also in Englishe bothe together, that we may se, how well they doo agree. And therfore in his allegation of the latin, what hath he done with this worde Memores, whiche is to say in Englishe mindefull. Why dyd he leaue out that, and wolde not bringe it to light? he thought perchaunce that Saynt Ambrose did not well to put it in. Or els he

thought to make an exchaynge with hym, and for that latyn worde, to gyue him in recompence, these thres or foure Englyshe woordes. That is to say, meaninge of the Sacramente. For what Latyn worde hathe Saynt Ambrose here, that may be trewlie turned in to thys Englishe worde meaninge? Or into this worde Sacrament? If he haue here none suche, (as he hath not in deede) what foloweth, but that Frithe of purpose did put them in, to deceyue and make the symple Englishe reader beleue it to be, the minde of Saynt Ambrose when it is but his owne false Heretikall practise, and nothinge els? As it may well appere by thys, that vnder the colour of a translatour, he playeth here the false expositer. And why? but as I sayde to seduce the reader. For where as Saynt Ambrose doeth ioyne these woordes (huius rei) and thys worde (Memores) together, whiche are to say, myndefull of thys thynge, Frithe putteth away this worde, memores, and ioyneth to huius rei, these woordes, in edendo & potando. Whiche beynge so ioyned are to say, in eatynge and drynkynge of thys thynge. Nowe to saye, myndefull of thys thinge, as Saynt Ambrose sayeth, and to saye, in eatynge and drinkinge of this thynge, as Fryth sayth thou mayst perceue, hath a greate difference. Whereby doeth it not euen clearely appere, how false a parte he playeth herein? And yet to make vs beleue, that Saynt Ambrose dyd meane, by thys same, huius rei, the Sacrament, he of hys owne head addeth vnto it, for an exposition thereof, these woordes, meanynge of the Sacramente. When Saynt Ambrose meaneth by it not so, nor anie thynge els, but (as

it is playne) the very same, that he maketh mention of before, whiche is the death of Christe, whereby we are delyuered, sayinge.

We myndefull of this thinge, in eating and drinking the fleshe and bloud, whiche were offered for vs, do signifie. HERE. Yet syr ye make thereof no parfyt sense. For as I asked of you before, what doo we sygnifie? we can not sygnifie except we sygnifie somewhat. And as ye doo handle it, there is nothing expressed. Wherefore there must, other be somewhat vnderstande, or els thys worde signifie maketh no sense at all. CATH. There is no doubte, but some thynge there is to be vnderstande. And what is that, but the deathe of Christe, whythe before is expressed? specially when Saynt Ambrose, meanynge none other, but euen the same doeth say.

We myndefull of this thinge do signifie it, in eatinge and drynkinge the fleshe and bloud whyche were offered for vs?

And this is the sense and very meaninge of Saynt Ambrose wordes. HERE. Here is a maruaylous thinge to see, how Frithes Englyshinge of thys matter and yours doeth dyffer. For where ye say, the meanynge of it is thys, that we sygnifie the death of christe, Frythe doeth say, we sygnifie the fleshe and bloud, whiche were offred for vs. CATH. If Frithe wyll needes vnderstande it and take it so, then I aske of him, how and after what maner do we sygnify them? HER. In eatynge and drynkinge sayeth S. Ambrose. CA. Ye, wherof? HERE. Frithe sayth, of the sacrament. CA. Ye but there frith lieth. For S. Ambrose saith not so

For

For he sayth, of the flesshe and blood whyche were offred for vs.

In eatinge and drinkinge of them (sayeth he) we signifie the deathe of Christ. For he hath not here any such worde as the Sacrament is, nor any suche meaninge as Frithe doeth say he meaneth nother. Wherfore by thys it may once agayne, euen playnly appere that Frythe doeth here falsefie belie Saynt Ambrose, as he doeth Saynt Austen, and all the other holy fathers besyde. And therefore I pray thee tell me one thinge, that I wil aske thee. HER. What is that? CATH. Thou seest what a place of Saynt Ambrose, Frithe hath pykte out for his purpose, and how he hath handled hym selfe therein. HERE. What of that?.

Cap. 44.

CATH. Why did he not as well alledge Saynt Ambrose in this place, that is to say, Libro. 4. de Sacrament. & Cap. 4. where hys wordes are euen these.

„ Panis iste panis est ante verba sacramentorum. Vbi „ accesserit consecratio, de pane fit Caro Christi.

That is to say.

„ This bread is breade, before the wordes of the Sacramen„ tes. But when the consecration is cum to it, there is made „ of the breade, the flesshe of Christe.

And in the next chapiter of the same booke, his wordes be also these.

„ Antequam consecretur, panis est. Vbi autem verba „ christi accesserit, corpus est Christi. Deniq; audi dicen„ tem. Accipite & edite ex eo omnes. Hoc est corpus meum.

meum. Et ante verba christi, Calix est vini & aquæ, plenus. Vbi verba christi operata fuerint, ibi sanguis, efficitur qui plebem redemit. That is to say.

It is breade, before it be consecrat. But when the wordes of Christe commeth to it, it is the body of Chryste. And for prouse therof, herken to him that sayth Take and eate of it, all you. This is my body. And before the wordes of Christ, the Chalice is full of wyne and water. But when the wordes of Christe hath wrought, there is made the bloud, whyche redemed the people.

Farthermore in the. 6. booke and the fyrst Chapiter of the same worke, his wordes be these.

Sicut værus est dei filius dominus noster Iesus Christus, non quemadmodum Homines per gratiam, sed quasi filius ex substantia patris, Ita væra caro, sicut ipse dixit, quam accipimus. That is to say.

As our Lorde Jesus chryste is the verye sonne of God, not as men are by grace, but as the Sonne of the substance of the father. So is it very flesshe, as he sayth him selfe, whiche we receyue.

Now therefore tell me why, that Frithe doeth not alledge these places of Saynt Ambrose (amonge many other lyke in hys wordes beside) as well as that other place, whiche he doeth alledge, and so falsely handle as I haue declared vnto thee: Is there any other why, but only because he was not able to deface the manifest trewth of these places, as he did (so farre as in hym lay) the trewth of the other? Beside thys, he doeth in the. 39. leafe of his booke alledge also the blessed martyr Saynt Cyprian in these wordes.

Cyprian sayeth (sayeth he) that the people is annered in the sacrament, throw the myxture of water.

why therfore doeth he not as well alledge hym in that place, where he hath these wordes.

Cipri. Serm. de cœna domini

Panis iste quem dominus discipulis porrigebat, non effigie, sed natura mutatus, omnipotentia verbi, factus est caro. That is to say.

, This breade, whiche our lorde gaue hys disciples, beynge
, chaynged, not in outward forme, but in nature, by the al-
, mighty power of the worde, is made flesshe.

This place made not for Frithes purpose. And in deede no more did the other nother, as it may well appere by this, that he nother doth, nor yet can frame any maner of proufe of hys purpose by it. For he doeth no more but without cause therof, fayne hym selfe to maruell, that men will not vnderstande and take it, as he doeth. For therevpon, his wordes be these.

, I maruell me muche (sayeth he) that they are so contenti-
, ous and wyll not see, that as the water is the people, so
, the wyne is christes bloud, that is to say, in a mistery, be-
, cause it representeth Christes bloud, as the water doeth
, the people.

Here thou seest, he gathereth of this place, whiche he doeth alledge of Saynt Cyprian, nothing els, but only a maruell, that we take it not as he wolde haue vs.

HERE. Yet for he doeth saye, that as the water is the people, so the wyne is Christes bloud, that is to say, in a mistery, because it representeth Christes bloud as the water doeth the people. CATH. Trewe it is, that so he sayeth, but so he doeth not proue it for all that. And therefore as he doeth but only say it of Christes bloud, euen so he doeth but only meane the lyke of Christes flesshe. Wherof Saynt Cyprian doeth not say, this bread is made in a mistery, sygne, or signification of flesshe, but

by

he sayeth it is made flesshe, That is to say, flesshe in deede for if he had not verelie beleued, the nature of the breade (whiche he taketh for the substance thereof) to be as he sayth, by the almighty power of the worde, conuerted and chaunged into the very flesshe of Christe in deede, he wolde neuer haue so sayde of it, as here thou hast hearde he doeth. Wherfore now thou seest how well S. Ambrose and Saynt Cyprian bothe, serueth hys purpose in Saynt Austen. And euen so wythout question, doeth all the rest of the olde holy Fathers which he doeth alledge beside. For doubtlesse of them all, he doth nothynge els, but onelie pyke out suche places, as he knew well, the vnlearned reader should not be able to vnderstande. Specially when he, for hys owne parte doeth set them so craftelie foorthe vnto hym, and handle them so vngratiously as he doeth. Whereof a parte, I haue here nowe declared vnto thee by manyfest example of hys wycked and false handelynge, not onely of Saynt Ambrose, but also of Saynt Cipryan to. But as for anye suche other places, whiche Saynt Ambrose, and the other holy Fathers haue so playne, as may easely put the symple reader in suertie of the trewth, and cleane out of doubt, he wolde in no wyse touche, nor bynge foorthe anie one of them, but so wynke at the matter, as thoughe there were no suche in deede. And therefore to knowe what he was, and what hys doynges are, what is there els, that thou woldest haue more, then I haue tolde thee? If thys to thee bee not enoughe, in very deede there is nothyng will serue. HERE. Yes yf somethynge wyll serue,

but yet not all this, I may say to you: CATHOLI. Why so: HERE. Because I doo knowe, why ye wolde so fayne haue done, & make such hast to be gone. CATHOLICVS. Why: HERE. Because Frithe hath one sayinge of a certayne Doctour to be answered vnto, whiche I perceyue ye be not willinge to meddell with all. CATH. What Doctour is that: HERE. Frithe shall tell you that, him selfe. For in the 76. leafe of hys booke, his wordes be these.

„ What there remayneth breade (sayeth he) myght be pro-
„ ued by the authorite of many doctours, whyche call it
„ breade and wyne, euen as Chryste and hys Apostles did.
„ And thoughe some Sophisters wolde wrest theyr say-
„ inges and expounde them after their owne phantasye,
„ yet shall I alledge them one doctour whiche was pope,
„ that maketh so playne with vs, that they shall neuer be a-
„ ble to avoyde hym. For Pope Gelasius writeth on thys
„ manner.

„ Certe Sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis & sanguinis
„ nis Christi, diuinæ res sunt. Propter quod & per
„ eadem diuinæ efficimur consortes uaturæ. Et tamen
„ non disinit esse substantia vel natura panis & vini.
„ Sed permanet in suæ proprietate naturæ. Et certe
„ Imago & similitudo corporis & sanguinis Christi in
„ actione Misteriorum celebrantur.

That is to say.

„ Suerly the sacramentes of the body and bloud of Chryste
„ whyche we receyue, are godlye thynges. Therefore thor-
„ row them are we made partakers of the godly nature.
„ And yet doeth it not cease to be the substance or nature of
„ breade and wine, but they contynew in the properte of
„ theyr owne nature. And suerly the Image and similitude
„ of the body and bloud of chryste are celebrated in the acte
„ of the mysteries.

Thys

This am I sure (saith he) that no man can anoyde it, nor
so wrest it, but that all men shall soone espy his folly. And
therfore I may conclude, that there remaineth the sub-
staunce and nature of bread and wyne.

Here ye maie now see, how sure of his purpose Fryth
maketh him selfe, by the playne testimonie of this doc-
tour. CATH. Pe but yet I perceiue, thou seest not,
how sure I make my selfe, that he for all this, is neuer-
theless deceiued. HERE. That were to straynge.
For there can be no plainer wordes for his purpose, then
he doth here alledge of this doctour. CATH. Thou
saiest wel, and therefore let vs returne to Saint Am-
brose againe. And that not onely with good remem-
braunce of what so euer I haue alledged of him vnto
the already, but also with dew consideration of this,
that I shall alledge of him more vnto the now. For in
the ninth chapiter of his workes intituled De his qui mi-
steriis initiantur, where he maketh a comparison bee-
twene the blessed body of Christe in the sacramente, and
the shadowes and figures therof in the ould law, he hath
euen these wordes.

Potior etenim lux quã vmbra, veritas q̃ figura, cor-
pus authoris quam Manna de cœlo. Forte dicas. Ali-
ud video. Quomodo tu mihi asseris quod Christi
corpus accipiam? Et hoc nobis adhuc superest, vt
probemus. That is to say.

Better is the light then the shadow, better is the trewth
then the figure, better is the body of the maker, then the
Manna from heauen. Peraduenture thou woldest say,
I see an other thynge. How affirmest thou to me, that
I receiue the body of Christe? That doth yet remaine for
vs to proue.

And now therfore take thou good heede, because for

his proke therof, these be part of his woordes.

„ Probemus hoc non esse quod natura formauit, sed
„ quod Benedictio consecrauit. Maioremq; vim esse Be-
„ nedictionis, quam naturæ. Quia Benedictione etiam
„ natura ipsa mutatur. That is to saie.
„ Let vs proue this not to be that, whiche nature hath for-
„ med, but that, whiche benediction hath consecrated. And
„ that the power of benediction, is more then the power of
„ nature. For thorow benediction also nature it selfe is
„ chaynged.

Whiche thinges he proueth by no lesse then manifest example of holy scripture, saiyng.

„ Virgam tenebat Moyses, proiecit eam & facta est ser-
„ pens. Rursus apprehendit caudam Serpentis & in vir-
„ gæ naturam reuertitur. Vides igitur prophetica gra-
„ tia, bis mutatam esse naturam & serpentis & virgæ.

That is to say.

„ Moyses had a rodde. He dyd cast it foorth, and it was
„ made a serpente. He tooke the serpente by the tayle,
„ and it was turned into the nature of the rodde agayne.
„ Therefore thou seest the nature, both of the Serpent,
„ and also of the rodde, by the prophetical grace, to be twise
„ chaynged.

Now after this example of the scripture and diuers other mo, he hath also these woordes.

„ Aduertimus igitur maioris esse virtutis gratiam,
„ quam naturam. Et adhuc tamen propheticæ Benedi-
„ ctionis numeramus gratiam, Quod si tantum valuit
„ humana Benedictio vt naturam conuerteret, Quid
„ dicimus de ipsa consecratione diuina, vbi verba ipsa
„ domini Saluatoris operantur? Nam sacramentum
„ istud quod accipis, Christi sermone conficitur.
„ Quod si tantum valuit Sermo Heliæ, vt ignem de

cœlo deponeret, Non valebit Christi sermo vt species » mutet elementorum? De totius Mundi operibus » legisti. quia ipse dixit & facta sunt, Ipse mandauit & » creata sunt. Sermo ergo Christi qui potuit ex nihi- » lo facere quod non erat, Non potest ea quæ sunt, » in id mutare quod non erant? Non enim minus est, » nouas, rebus dare, quam mutare naturas. »

That is to sate.

Therefore we perceiue grace to be of more power then na- » ture. And yet hytherto we recken the grace of the prophe- » ticall benediction. wherin, if mannes benediction was so » stronge, that it did chainge nature, what say we of the di- » uine consecracion it selfe, where the selfe same woordes » of our Lorde and Sauiour doth worke? For this sacra- » ment whiche thou doest receiue, is made by the worde of » Christ. For if the woorde of Helias was so stronge, that it » brought doune fyre from heauen, shall not the woorde of » Christe be so stronge, that it maie chaynge kyndes of e- » lementes? Thou haste redde of the woorkes of the » whole worlde, that he spake the woord, and they » were made, he commaunded, and they were create. » Therefore can not the woord of Christe, which was a- » ble to make that of nothinge, which was not, chainge » those thinges that are, into that which they were not? » For it is not lesse, to geue new natures to thinges, then it » is to chaynge them. »

Here thow hast now herde, what Saint Ambrose saith. And therfore I wolde fayne know of Frith, how he wold ioyne that saiynge of Gelasius, and these of Saint Ambrose together? HER. How can they be ioyned together, when they be cleane contrary? for gelasi⁹ doth say. That it sealeth not to be the substaunce or nature of bread, and wyne, but they continew in the propertee of their, owne nature. »

And Saint ambrose doth say.

That

» That thorow benediction the nature is chaunged. And » thorow consecracion, there is made of the breade, the » flesshe of Christe. And thorow the operacion of Christes » woordes, there is made of the wine and water, the blood » which redemed the people.

And so after him, there remaineth no substaunce nor nature of bread and wyne at all. But after Gelasius there remaineth both. Wherefore these two doctours be directly one against an other. CATH. And dost thou beleue, that they be so in dede? HERE. It is so plain, I can not chuse. CATH. Then is Frith not onely therein against the, but also against him selfe to. For thou knowest (as I tolde the before) that he doth in these woordes aske this question.

» Who wolde once surmise that Saint Austen dissented in » this great matter from the other faithfull fathers, or they » from him?

As who say no man wolde so surmise. And therefore if none of them, in this great matter, dissented from S. Austen, nor he from them, It foloweth thereof, that none of them, dissented from other. If none of them dissented from other, and Gelasius one of them in deede, as Frith him selfe doth take him to be, then doth Saint Ambrose and Gelasius by Frithes owne sayings agree together well enough. Therefore if Saint Ambrose and Gelasius do agree together well enough, why doth not Frith in this great matter, beleue them both, that is to say as wel saint ambrose in these places which I haue recited, as he doth gelasius in that place, which he doth recite? HERE. It were but reason, if they did agree together in deede, but plaine it is they do not so. CAT. Then Frith doth lie. For by his owne saying they do

agree

agree for all that. CATH. If they do not, how come this to passe, that none of them bothe, in all this longe tyme, from their dates hytherto, hath bene touched with any sclaunder or note of heresy? Frith scaped not so, but was quickly taken for an heretyke, as he was mete worthy. Therefore if they had dissented in this great matter one from an other (as Frith doth say, they did not) there is no doubt, but one of them both, had bene an heretyke in dede, and could not haue scaped away withall, thus longe in the Churche of Christe, without the worthy infamie and note therof. HERE. Yes sir well enoughe. For in this case, there is no matter of heresie at all. For Frith saith, there is no man bounde to beleue it vnder peyne of damnation. CATH. Although I toulde the enough of that satynge of his, euen yester day, yet now therin, marke his lacke, of witte, learnyng, or grace, or els rather of al thre. For here thou hast herd, how he calleth it, and confesseth it to be a great matter. HERE. That is trew. CATH. And I toulde the yester day, how and where, he calleth it an article of our faith. HER. Ye but none of our crede, he saith. CATH. Yet an article of our faith he confesseth it to be for all that. And therfore when he dooth confesse it to be, not onelie an article, but also a great matter, what other thinge therin dooth he, but (althoughe vnwares to hym selfe) confesse it to be a great article of our fayth. For the article can not be small, and the matter thereof great. And therefore if it be a great article of our fayth (as it is in deede) wherein dooth heresy consist, if it be not, in the not beleuynge thereof? And who denieth it to be a damnable faut, not to beleue

a great article of our fayth, but such a great heretike, or the very same that Frith was in deede: when the not beleuynge, of the least article therof, is enough to make an heretike with all. Wherfore this maist thou see what wit, learnynge, or grace was in Frythes head, that wolde say they doue agree, and dissent not one from an other (as they do not in deede) and yet houlde not so muche with the one, as he doth directly agaynste the other, that is to say, not so muche with Gelasius, as against holy Saint Ambrose.

Cap. 45.

HERE. Syr I pray you let that passe. And to this, that (as I perceiue) you do take these two doctours, S. Ambrose and Gelasius, not to dissent one from an other, but very well to agree togēther, wherat I meruayle, their wordes being so contrary as they are. CAT. Of their agrement I haue no doubt. But whether they be the very wordes of Gelasius which Frith doth here alledge of him or no, I haue some doubt of that, because he doth not show, nor note in what place of Gelasius workes, we maie fynde them. But let vs graunt him the most he can aske, that they be the verye wordes of Gelasius in deede. And therefore let me see what he can gette by that? HER. No more but euen as the very wordes of Gelasius doth declare, whiche are playne, that

» It dooth not cease to be the substance or nature of bread » and wyne, but they continew in the propertee of their » owne nature.

Therefore what doubt can there be, in the meaninge of these

these so plaine wordes? CATH. Some perchaunce in this, that he saith, it ceaseth not to be the substance or nature of bread and wyne. He saith not the substance and nature, but the substaunce or nature, As doubtynge whiche of them both he myght best say. And therfore it is incertaine to Frith, whiche of them both he ment. HERE. That is not so. For there is no doubt, but Gelasius ment as well the one as the other, and referreth to vs, the libertee of vnderstanding or taking of whiche we lyst, because although they be two wordes, yet they are both of one signification. CATH. They are some tyme confounded (thou maist say) and taken one for an other, But yet not bothe of one proper signifycacyon for all that. For substaunce perteyneth properly to the principall beynge of a body, makyng it to be the same that it is. And nature, although it bee some tyme taken more generally or largely for the whole thinge, yet commonly it perteyneth but to the accidentall qualitees, and propertees therof, declarynge it to bee rather suche as it is, then what it is. Therfore if Fryth saye, that Gelasius ment both substance and nature, that I maie well denie, because his woordes be disiunctiuelie spoken, of the one, or the other. HER. Yet maie we then choose, and take which of them we will. CAT. Which shall that be? HER. Substaunce. CATH. Nay not so. For thereof Gelasius maketh a restraynt him selfe, if thou marke it well. For when he dooth say, They continew in the propertee of their nature, he sayth not, in the propertee of their substaunce. Whiche had bene as much to saye, as in the propertee of their chiefe and principall beynge.

For of the substaunce euery thynge that is a body, (as breadde and also wyne is) hath his nomination. Therfore he saith not in the propertee of their substaunce. But in the propertee of their nature, as of a lesse beynge then of substaunce. And yet euen therein, this is also to be noted to, that he sayth not in their nature, but in the propertee of their nature. For nature and the propertee of nature, is not without a difference, as it is well proued by this, that the one proceedeth and is sayde of the other. For the propertee of nature, is but the operacion of it accordynge to the same. Whereof nature is some tyme letted by one occasion or other. And yet then, although it be so put or let from the proper operacion thereof, it is neuertheleſſe nature ſtyll for all that. And therefore Gelasius, to amende or qualyfye, his woordes of substaunce or nature, and to auoyde all synyster vnderſtandynge therof, doth adde vnto them and saye, They continew in the propertee of their nature. As he mighte saie, I do not meane the verye substaunce or nature it selfe, but the naturall quantitees, qualitees, and propertees thereof. Wherefore, if he had ment (as Frith dooth take him to meane) the very substaunce or nature it selfe of breadde and wyne ſtyll to remayne in deede, it had beene superfluous and to no purpose, but rather a very folly to tell vs, (as he dooth) that they continew in the propertee of their nature. For who dooth not know, that all substanciall and naturall thinges, for the tyme of their beyng, do contynew in the propertee of theyr nature? Therefore, Gelasius was to wyſe, and to well learned, to

teach

teache vs that, for a speciall or a necessary lesson, whych euery man knoweth alredy. HERE. Why euery man doeth know, that they contynew in the properte of theyr nature. CATH. Ye but euery man doeth not knowe that they so do, wythout their owne proper substance. And that is the cause, why Gelasius doeth so say therof as he doeth. For els he should speake it wythout cause or any neede at all. And that he wolde not do. For yf he had thought or ment, that the very substance or nature it selfe, of breade and wyne, had therin contynued styll, he wolde not haue sayde they contynew in the propertee of theyr nature, whiche euery man knoweth, but he wolde haue sayde they contynew in the verytee of theyr substance, because the contrary therof, is wel and trewly beleued. For therin lyeth all the doubt or question if anie be. In so muche, that when it is hearde, that the substance or nature of a thynge doeth cease to be, it is thought, by and by, that the propertee thereof doeth cease wythall, because in the common course of thinges, it doeth so in deed. This same thought therfore, did Gelasius intende to helpe, when he sayth, they contynew in the propertie of their nature. As who saye, although theyr proper substance and nature be chaynged yet they continew in the propertee of theyr nature for al that, and in nothing els, as the trewth is, they do not in deede. Agayne of the other syde, when it is hearde, that the propertee of nature in any thynge, doeth holde and contynew, it is thought streyght way, that the substaunce and nature of the thynge, doeth also contynew likewise. Wherefore that same thought, dyd Saynt Ambrose purpose to helpe, when and where he doeth

say, that.

» Thorow benediction the nature is chaynged. And thorow » the consecration, there is made of the breade, the flesshe of » Christe. And thorow the operation of Christes wordes, » there is made of the wyne and water, the bloud whyche » redemed the people. And as our Lorde Jesus Chryste is » the very sonne of God, so it is very flesshe (as he sayth him » selfe) whiche we receaue.

Here thou mayst playnlie perceyue, according to the agrement of these two doctours, how the one defendeth the other. For who so euer wolde take and gather of S. Ambrose, that there doeth not remayne the naturall propertee of breade and wyne, because he speaketh so playne of the alteration and chaynge of the substance or nature therof, Gelasius doeth directly for hym answer and say, they contynew in the propertee of theyr nature. That is to say, the propertee of theyr nature doeth contynew styll, although the substance or nature it selfe be chaynged. And who so euer wolde, for this sayinge, take and gather of Gelasius (as Fryth doth) that there remayneth the very substance or nature of breade and wyne styll, because he speaketh so playne, of the continewance of the naturall propertee thereof, Saynt Ambrose doeth in that behalfe, directlie answer and say, that.

» Thorow benediction the nature is chaynged. And by con- » secration there is made of the breade, the flesshe of Christ, » and so forth.

Wherfore, by thys it doeth moste clerely appere, that Frithe was not deceaued in that he sayeth, these sayth-full fathers dyssented not one from an other, but well and trewlie agreed together. But how therefore,

doeth

doeth he agree with him selfe, in this that he so sayeth, and yet alloweth not so muche the sayinge of the one, as he dooeth vtterlye deny the sayinge of the other? when dyrectelie agaynst Saynt Ambrose he doeth say, there remayneth the substaunce and nature of bread and wyne. Who can be more agaynst hym, then he is herein agaynst hym selfe? He holdeth wyth the saying of Gelasius, but not with the saying of Saynt Ambrose. And yet doeth holde, that they dissent not one from an other. Hast thou heard of any man, that euer framed hys thynges together after this sorte? HER. Why say you that he holdeth not with Saynt ambrose? If he helde not with hym, he wolde not alledge him so often as he doeth. CATHOLI. Thou sayest well. For euen so he holdeth wyth Saynt Ambrose, as he doeth (for all hys sayinge) wyth Gelasius.
That is to say, wyth none of them both. For it is two thinges for hym, to holde with them, and to holde wyth his owne false vnderstandinge of them, as he, thou, and manie other doeth. For yf he sought in them anie thinge els but that, he wolde not (as he did) pyke out onlie suche places, as be to the simple reader darke and obscure, but wolde haue set foorthe as well suche other places, as are cleare and out of all question, and not omitte or rather hyed them (as I tolde thee before) euen purposly to deceue. HERE. How should he set foorthe such playne places of them, as ye speake of, when parchaunce he neuer saw them? CATH. May thou shalt not excuse hym so. For in the. 81. leafe of hys booke, his woordes are these.
Of this (sayeth he) springeth the maner of speakynges,
that

» that the olde fathers do sometime vse. whiche at the fyrst » syght, myght seme contrary to our sentence. But yf they » be well pondered, it may soone be seen, how they should » be taken.

Now tell me, how coulde he (as here he doeth) make mention of that maner of their speakynges, whyche (as he confesseth) mought seme contrary to hys sentence, if he had not seen them? And hauinge seen them, what is the cause, that he bringeth foorthe none of them, to let vs see, how they do but seeme contrary to hys sentence, and may be otherwyse taken? Is there any cause why, but that he knew, they wolde make cleane agaynst him, sythe hys owne woordes declare no lesse, but at the least, they seme so to do? Therefore in auoydinge of all doubt, why doeth he not bringe foorthe some of them, that we might see, how they seeme, and how he wolde proue that they do no more but so? HERE. Marry syr, he doeth euen immediatly folowinge show ye how, and that in these woordes.

» Many tymes (sayeth he) when they speake of the Sacra- » ment and outwarde eatinge, they applie vnto the Sacra- » ment and outwarde eatinge, the fruite and conditions of » the inwarde eatinge and thynge it selfe. Because, that in » a faythfull man, they are so ioyntly ioyned, that the one is » neuer without the other.

Lo here he doeth tel, how that maner of speakinges and sayinges of the olde fathers, are in those places, to be taken and vnderstande. CATH. In what places? HERE. In those, where their sayinges might seme (as he sayeth) to be contrary to hys sentence. CATH. What be those sayinges? HERE. That shall not skyl, for here he hath showed you how they should be taken. CATH. Hast thou heard of any man so mad, so faoliſhe,

or rather so false, that wolde make an exposition, vpon no special recitall of any sayinge: where are the wordes of those olde fathers: where shall we finde that maner of theyr speakynges: where or whiche are the places wherin they make this application that he speaketh of: He telleth vs not that. But maketh vs an exposition, we see not whereof. He sendeth vs forthe, and will not tell vs wether. How shall we trie his sayinge, or herein make him answer: HERE. That is no matter, for he requyreth none. CATH. Thou sayest euen trew. For so that his sayinge might be allowed, he wolde aske no more. But full well did he know, that if he had alleged those playne places or anie of them, thys false glose of his, coulde haue done him no seruise. And therefore he thought it better for hys purpose, to reporte them as he liste, then with any iuste recitall of theyr owne wordes, to let them reporte them selues. Wherfore yf thou wilt thy selfe, thou mayest now, easely perceyue, the cause why he bringeth not forth, those manifest and playne places of the olde Fathers, as he doeth the other obscure, whiche he doeth so falsly handel, as I haue declared vnto thee.

Cap. 46.

HERE. Syr ye can lay no suche handlinge of Helasius wordes vnto his charge. For he maketh no maner of exposition of them, but doeth take the euen as he fyndeth them. CATH. Euen as he findeth them: what is that to the purpose: for if thou go to fyndinge, why did he not take the Catholike sayth, euen as

he founde it? For once he founde that well enoughe, if he wolde haue kept it. And because he wolde not kepe it, therfore he losse it. And not onely that, but also the trew vnderstanding of them, whiche dyd most parfitlie teache it. For how myght he vnderstande the very teachers of trewth, when he hym selfe, was so vnmeetlye bent as he was, agaynst the trewthe? And for a more clere knowledge therof, thou must consider, that trewth is denied two maner of wayes. One, in the bare worde it selfe, an other, in the meanynge therof. And therfore whether the trewth of the worde and the trewth of the meaning go bothe together, or els a sonder, (as some tyme they do, and some tyme not) yet Frithe thou shalt finde vnable to be defended in any of them bothe. As when Saynt Ambrose doeth say.

, Thorow benediction the nature is chaynged.

Trewth is there, bothe in the worde, and also in the meanings. Whyche Frithe (as well in the one as in the other) doeth vtterly denie. Where he sayeth.

, There remayneth the substance & nature of breade & wyne.

And agayne when Gelasius doeth say.

, It ceaseth not to be the substance or nature of breade and , wyne.

Trewth is there also, in the meaninge, but not in the worde, as Frithe doeth take it. For he taketh substaunce there, as the logition doeth take it. And as it is one of the ten predicamentes, where it is alway taken in corporall thinges, to signifie that, whyche sustreyneth, and is as a receptacle of naturall quantite, & qualites, as heate, colde, colour, odor, forme, figure, or such other. For that, wherin those accidētal quātites and qualites are conteyned, is (as it ought to be) after the logi-

tion,

tion, called the substance of the thyng. And in that sense, doeth Frithe take it, wherin he was vtterlie deceaued, or willinge to deceaue. For here, it ought not so to be taken. And therfore after that sense, trewth is not here in the worde, but yet in the meanynge for all that.
For yf the worde had here bene put in that sense, there had bene no trewth in anye of them bothe. That is to say, nother in the worde, nor yet in the meanyng nother.
MERR. Why syr, dyd Frithe amisse to take the meaninge of Gelasius, accordinge to the worde? CATH. Why doest thou aske of me that question, sithe indede, he tooke it not so? for when the worde hath dyuerse and manie meaninges, how coulde Frith be sure to take the meaning accordyng to the worde, before he had made it certayne, in whyche of those meanynges the worde is put? For substance, is a worde of suche a sorte, as by that, is mente some tyme one thynge and some tyme an other. In so muche, that some tyme it is taken for worldlie goodes, by reason whereof, we say of a ryche man, that he is a man of greate substance. Some tyme, when we beholde a goodly new buyldinge, we say that it is substantially done. There, substaunce is applied partlie to the strengthe of the thynge to contynew, and partely to the connynge of the artificer.
Also it is some tyme taken for a certayne quantytee of stuffe, and some qualytee of workemanshyp.
As when a man commeth to a Drapers shoppe, to bye hym a Cloke or a gowne clothe, and hathe an endee of the peace turned oute vnto hym to looke vpon, he desyreth at lengthe to see the other ende of it, and when he hathe felte that in hys hande,

ye marry sayeth he, here is an other maner of substance in thys ende, then is in the other, cut me therefore that I shall haue, suts of this ende. Therefore what meaneth he, by that other maner of substance, but a more quantitee of stuffe, and some qualite of better makynge in that ende, then in the other. For the verie substance of bothe the endes, and also of the whole clothe, after the Logition, is all one. But not so after the common vse of speakynge. Agayne it is also taken sometyme, for the pythe or principall parte of a tale. As when we heare a man longe aboute the vtteringe thereof, we byd hym go quicklie to the substance of the matter. Substance is not there, taken after the logition nother, but after the common speache. Beside thys, it is some tyme taken for nature it selfe, as nature is also taken for it, and that as though there were no difference betwene them. And so doeth Gelasius put it here, when he sayeth.

„ It ceaseth not to be the substance or nature of breade and
„ wyne.

Meaninge indeede none of them bothe after the logtion. But yet in that he doeth say, substance or nature, he putteth no difference betwene them, but (as thou saydest before) take whiche we list, it is all one to hym. For yf they had not beene to hym as bothe one in thys case, he wolde not haue put as he did, the one or the other. As who saye I care not whiche ye take, but he wolde haue put the one and the other, (as two distincte) or the one and not the other, (wherin had beene no question) or els nether of them bothe. Therefore sythe it was all one to hym, to take of them,

whiche

whiche we like, it foloweth well, that he did not put the one, but for the other. And whiche for other, that was, his owne order of woordes doth well declare. Which is not, nature or substaunce, but substaunce or nature. He putteth substaunce before, for that which he putteth after, as an exposicion thereof. That is to say, nature. Therfore he saith substaunce or nature, as who say by substaunce I meane nothynge els but nature. For if he had put nature for substaunce, as he doth substaunce for nature, he wolde not haue ioyned vnto them these woordes, saiyng, they continew in the properte of their nature, but he wold haue said, they cõtinew in the propertie of ther substãce. How be it, he wold not say so, because it had bene directly agaynst his purpose. Wherfore euen as he dooth put substaunce for nature, so in very deede, he doth put nature for the propertee of nature. And therfore as a playne exposicion of his mynde therein he doth say, they continew in the propertee of their nature. As who say therein is all the beynge they haue. For if he had thought them to haue any other, or more beynge then that, it had bene but a vayne saiynge of him, to say that they continew in the propertie of their nature, when it had bene farre better, more certaine, and playner, to say they continue in their very substaunce, or very nature it selfe, which towcheth ther whole beynge, where as the propertee of their nature, toucheth but a parte of it. For the proper nature of bread and wyne it selfe, and the propertee of their nature, is two thinges. And therfore Gelasius saith not, that they continew in their proper nature, but in the propertee of their nature, which is lesse. And so muche of bread and wyne, we graunte

to remaine in the holy sacrament, as well after the consecracion as before. And yet not afterwarde, any substance or nature of bread and wyne for all that, excepte thou take nature, for the onely accidentall quantitees, qualitees, and propertees therof, as it is oft tymes used to be taken. Ye and somtime for the condicions and behauiour of men, both good and badde. As when we see a man of a customable gentle behauiour, we say, he is a man of a gentle nature. Againe when we see a man of the contrary sorte, and alway intractable, we say he is a a man of a straynge nature, or a man of an euill nature. And as some will say, I neuer saw man of that nature. And yet all men are but of one nature, as nature is some way taken. Therfore when substaunce and nature both, may and daily are, so diuersly used and taken, as they are in dede, what can Frith (for all his craakes) get of gelasius, by those wordes: he should first haue tried and made it certaine, how or in what sence gelasius dyd put them and what he meaneth by them. And then so to allege them with their dew exposicion accordingly. But that, because he neuer used to do with S. aust. nor S. ambrose, he thought it to late to begyn it with Gelasius. For he did better like the first sound of those wordes after his owne minde, then he did the very meanyng of them, after gelasius mynde. Wherfore this maist thou see how very nothing Gelasius maketh for him, although they were the very woordes of Gelasius in deede. Therefore what if they bee not his woordes? how then?

HERE. Then some where, I must needes graunte a faute, if it were so. How be it, I can not beleue that euer Frith wolde alledge them in Gelasius name, if they were not Gelasius woordes in deede. Lay.

Cap. 47.

CATH. Then for a farther triall thereof, I wolde wisshe the to take so muche payne (which were not great) as to reade ouer that notable and worthy booke, intituled, (the assertion and defente of the sacrament of the aulter) made by maister doctour Smith of Oxforde a man well knowen to be of great and famouse learnyng. Wherin amonge other his good and perferte solutions, to a great sorte of Frithes hereticall obiections, thou shalt fynde one solution concernyng this matter, in the. 148. leafe of the said booke, where part of the woordes be these.

For an answere here vnto (meanyng Frithes allegacion of Gelasius) ye shall vnderstand (saith he) that this saiyng, ascrybed vnto Gelasius, beynge of this sorte as it is, is neyther founde in anie of the woorkes reputed and taken for the trew and vndoubted woorkes of Gelasius, nor yet it is so redde in the sayd booke, intituled, Antidotum contra hereses, as here in this obiection it is deduced, like as it shall manifestly appere vnto the reader therof, conferrynge them both together. And vndoubtedly amonges learned catholyke men, it is constantly beleued, that this saiyng of Gelasius, as it is here deduced, is falsly ascrybed vnto gelasius, and counterfet by the lutherians, who (for the maintenance of their false errour and naughtie opinion or heresy, beyng that with the very trew body and blood of Christe, there remaineth materiall breadde and materiall wine) haue so contriued the matter, that where in all Gelasius woorkes, there can not be founde any one saiynge after this sort, they haue yet iobbed it in, in an other booke. Ye and to auoyde suspicion of falshed, and to get them the better credite, they haue put it in the sayde booke, hauynge an honeste name, beynge intituled, a tryacle or remedy agaynste heresies, thynkynge, that in suche a booke, hauynge suche a title no man will thynke,

» thinke that any hereſies are planted at all, to be maintey-
» ned in anye wyſe, But that in ſuche a booke all ve-
» rittees and catholike aſſertions are ſet forth to bee allowed.
» And that this is very lyke te be as I do ſay, it appereth in
» maner notoriſully of it ſelfe, as well for that the ſayde ſai-
» ynge, as here it is deduced, is not (as I ſayde) amonges
» the other ſaiynges of Gelaſius in his knowne and appro-
» ued woorkes, as alſo for that no writer (in the ſayd Gelaſi-
» us tyme) dyd eyther holde this opinion, ſo aſcribed to ge-
» laſius, nor yet any thynge ſpeaketh in or for the confuta-
» cion therof, which vndoubtedly they woulde haue done,
» in caſe the thynge had bene ſo in deede, as it is deduced
» and purpoſed for trew, ſemblably as they did the lyke, a-
» gaynſte all other errour and hereſies, whiche then dyd
» ſprynge and were sowne abrode, eſpecially beyng of ſuch
» importaunce and weyght as this is of. Moreouer this
» thyng by the way (good reader) maie be noted to the great
» confuſion and ſhame of theſe falſifyers and corrupters of
» bookes (as Fryth is and other alſo of that ſorte) that the
» ſaiynge of Gelaſius is ſo here reherſed, that a plaine man
» wolde thinke that Gelaſius had ſo ſayde, as Fryth dooth
» here bryngе him in, and lookyng vpon the boke intituled
» ANTIDOTVM, out of whiche, the ſaiynge of Ge-
» laſius is extracted, there ſhall ye fynde farre otherwyſe.
» Ye and moreouer, the thynge whiche ye ſhall fynde there,
» in the foreſayde booke, it is ſo corrupted, that ye can not
» (as it is there) make any ſentence of it. &c.

Now theſe woordes of this great learned mannes ſet-tynge forth, with the reſte that folowe in the ſame place, if thou woldeſt thoroughly reade, peruſe, and well way them with indifferent iudgement, thou ſhouldeſt eaſyly perceyue, whether there be ſo muche as anye lykelyhood that thoſe pretended woordes of Gelaſius be Gelaſius woordes in deede, or no. Therfore if they be not what doth Fryth get by them? Of the other ſide, if they were his woordes as Fryth doth ſay they be, yet

well

well and trewly, waied, considered and with reason vnderstande, thou shouldest fynde (as it doth now already appere) that they make not onely nothynge for him, but also rather, euen cleane agaynst him. Wherfore, sith (as I told the at the fyrst) that all frithes purpose in the olde holy doctours, was no more but only to get some colour of, or by such certein sayinges of theirs, as he could & did pyke out, to make it (as it were by them) seme that his vnderstandynge of those places of scripture, whiche he doth meddle with all, could not be but trew, pretending that they were to bee taken in the same onely sense that he did put them for. And againe sith it is now proued, that the chiefe of all those places of the holy fathers, whiche he did so pyke out, and most trusted vpon, he did but falsely vnderstande after his own blinde phansy, and not after their mindes, but far otherwyse and clean contrary to their meanynges, as it hath most plainly appered, euen by the testimony of their owne sayinges, which I haue trewly recited vnto the, what folowth herof but this: if his vnderstanding of those places of scripture be trew, thers is false. if theirs be trew, his is false. And whiche shall we take: for both, we can not they be so contrary. Therefore because their vnderstandyng thereof, is well knowne to be so trew, that euen he him selfe nether did nor durste deny it, and his vnderstandyng so false, that all the colour and craft he could set apon it, is not able to defend nor hide it, who is so blind, weywarde, and wylfull, as, notwithstandynge al this, will yet trust or beleue him: any other but suche, as passeth not muche, whether they go to god or the diuel: wherefore, if the dew consideration hereof, be not e-

nought to a certayne thee, that he was but a false and a wicked teacher of errour and Heresye, it shalbe enought to a certen me, that thou arte but a man intractable, and full of insatiabilite. And therfore more of me now, thou gettest not at thys time. HERE. Yes syr a litle, I pray you. For what say you to hys naturall reasons, whiche ye haue reported to be nothynge worthe, and promised to proue the same? Therefore I wolde fayne here, what ye wolde say to some of them eare we parte. CATH. I maruel that euer thou wilt require, looke after, or regarde anye reasons of hys, whome thou hast seene proued so false and foolishe as he was. For thou hast now hearde to manie good reasons agaynst him, to thynke that anye of hys, can make wyth him. For verie reason thou mayest well knowe, can neuer be agaynst it selfe. Nor anie one of that sorte agaynst an other, be they neuer so manie. And therefore the manyfest trewth of those reasons, whiche thou hast hearde agaynst hym all redy, myght make thee sure, that none of hys can holde, although they seeme neuer so muche to the contrarie. HERE. Ye but syr, ye must answer them otherwyse then so, or els can not I be content. For hys reasons, I may say to you, worketh more in my head, then all that euer he sayeth beside. CATH. Then must thou take a new daye, for I wyll tarry no longer aboute that matter nowe. HERE. Then what say you to thys, that ye haue loste a greate peece of the labour, whiche ye haue taken at thys tyme alredy. CATH. Although in thee, I feare the same, yet I wolde haue thee tell

me

me, how or wherein. HERE. In that ye haue so spiced your talke, wyth suche obscure wordes and straynge termes at many tymes, ỳ I can not tell what ye meane by them. CATH. Why diddest thou not tell me so then, when I dyd speake them and was in hande wyth them? HERE. I thought I wolde not let your purpose so muche, but wolde and did rather herken, wherupon ye wolde rest in the ende. CATH. Then, why fyndest thou more faute with any obscuritee or straungenesse of my wordes, then thou doest wyth any of Frithes wordes? for he useth as straynge wordes as I do, and more straynge to. For in the .42. leafe of hys booke, thus he sayeth.

What neede he (meanynge Saint Austen) to make these, woordes and Antitheses, but because. &c.

Now what understandest thou by thys worde antitheses? Canst thou tell what it meaneth?

And agayne in the .52. leafe, where also he sayeth.

It must be, Ratione porositatis vt in igne & ferro, nam penetrationem dimentionum nunquam probabit.

This, he doth not so muche, as expresse, or turne into englyshe. how be it that was perchaunce because his ignorant disciples should thinke him the greater clarke. for some there be, that, the lesse they understand of what so euer they heare, the better lerned iudge they him, which is the speker. But notwithstanding, if he had put foorth the very englishe of it, as it had bene his parte to do, sith he wryteth in Englishe, yet how muche shouldest thou haue bene the wyser for that? HER. Euen so muche as the understandyng of that commeth to. For then I should haue knowen what he meaneth by it. CAT. that will I see streight way. For the englishe of it is this.

» It muſt be (ſayeth he) by reaſon of poꝛoſite, as in eyet and » yꝛon, foꝛ penetration of dementions he ſhall neuer pꝛoue.

Now tell me what he meaneth by it? HERE. That coulde I ſoone doo, yf it were not foꝛ a woꝛde oꝛ two. CATHOLI. why foꝛ that woꝛde oꝛ two, but becauſe thou doeſt not vnderſtande them? And why doeſt thou not vnderſtande them, but becauſe they be to thee, obſcure and ſtraynge as euery thinge is to him that knoweth it not. And therefoꝛe ſythe he vſeth woꝛdes and termes, moꝛe obſcure and ſtraynge then I do, how come this to paſſe, that thou canneſt not as well away with the obſcurite and ſtrayngeneſſe of my talke full of trewth, as thou canneſt wyth the obſcurite and ſtraygenes of hys talke, full of errour and falſhed? Wherein thys augmenteth my marueil greatlie, that euer thou woldeſt be ſo lyght and ſo raſhe as to chaynge thy faythe in ſo weyghty a matter as thys is, beynge not able (as thou arte not, by thine owne ſayinge) to vnderſtande ſuche conuenient and neceſſary talke therof, as it requireth vpon ſuche occaſion, as Frythe and other Heretikes hath giuen vnto it. Wherefoꝛe in thoſe poyntes, whyche thou art ignoꝛant of, truſt nother thy ſelfe, noꝛ yet thoſe, whiche are as blynde as thou arte, oꝛ as falſe as Frithe was. But conſulte wyth ſuche as can ſkyll, and be of good wyll, foꝛ at theyꝛ handes thou ſhalt be ſure of nothynge but trewth. And now get thee hence I pꝛay thee, foꝛ I haue ſome what els to doo. HERE. Then ſyꝛ, when ſhall I come vnto you agayne to here what ye can ſay to Frythes reaſons? CATHOLICVS. Come to me when thou wylt. HERE. To moꝛrow by eyght

of the cloke? CATH. Content. HER. Then I wyll say no moze at thys tyme, but God be wyth you. CATH. Farewell.

FINIS.

Faultes escaped in the prynting.

Leafe.	Syde.	Lyne.	Faultes.	Corrected.
.3.	.2.	24.	and also of	and first of
.3.	.2.	30.	other the	the other
.11.	.2.	30.	he doth meane	he doeth not meane
.16.	.1.	21.	this wozd bread	this wozde eate
.16.	.2.	1.	folow the other	folow of the other
.24.	.2.	3.	adoraueri	adorauerit
32.	.1.	23.	ys he wolde not	yet he wolde not
.39.	.1.	1.	foz this as	foz as this.
.46.	.1.	27.	thou that takeſt	thou takeſt
.61.	.1.	1.	ſupernartuall	ſupernaturall
.62.	.21.	27.	foz he wolde	foz els he wolde
.70.	.1.	34.	is it not alſo	is it alſo
.76.	.2.	5.	Membres	Memores.
.81.	.1.	18.	acceſſerit	acceſſerint
.82.	.2	27.	the wozdes.	theſe wozdes
.83.	.1.	23.	in his wozdes	in his wozkes.

IMPRINTED AT LONDON IN FLETESTRETE BI THOMAS POVVELL.

Cum priuilegio ad imprimendum solum.

ANNO. M. D. LVII.